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Introduction: This study explores the potential of enhancing shale oil recovery and reducing CO₂ emissions through CO₂ injection in fractured shale reservoirs. The importance of this approach lies in its dual benefit: improving oil extraction efficiency and addressing environmental concerns associated with CO₂ emissions.

Method: We employed a discrete fracture-matrix model to simulate CO₂ flooding in fractured shale reservoirs, utilizing both discontinuous Galerkin (DG) and continuous Galerkin (CG) finite element methods. The DG-CG FEM’s accuracy was validated against the McWhorter problem, ensuring the reliability of the simulation results. Our model also considered various factors, including reservoir heterogeneity, fracture permeability, CO₂ injection volume, and gas injection patterns, to analyze their impact on shale oil recovery.

Result: Our simulations revealed that fractured reservoirs significantly enhance shale oil production efficiency compared to homogeneous reservoirs, with an approximate 48.9% increase in production. A notable increase in shale oil production, by 15.8%, was observed when fracture permeability was increased by two orders of magnitude. Additionally, a fourfold increase in CO₂ injection rate resulted in a 31.5% rise in shale oil production. Implementing a step-by-step reduction in injection volume while maintaining the total CO₂ injection constant proved to be more effective than constant-rate injections.

Discussion: The study demonstrates the effectiveness of CO₂ flooding in fractured shale reservoirs for enhancing shale oil recovery.
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1 Introduction

The effective exploitation of unconventional oil and gas is of great strategic significance to alleviate the contradiction between oil and gas supply and demand, promoting the low-carbon transformation of energy structure (JIN et al., 2021a). In China, shale oil resources are abundant and exhibit extensive geographical distribution. Nonetheless, notable challenges persist, notably concerning the low recovery and limited production experienced by individual wells (JIN et al., 2021b). The shale oil development goal of China is to achieve a production output of 6.5 million metric tons by 2025, with increasing shale oil recovery rate serving as a crucial support for realizing the objective (Yang and Huang, 2019).

Since supercritical CO₂ can rapidly penetrate into the microporosity of reservoir rocks, CO₂ injection for enhanced recovery has been applied industrially in the field of oil and gas development (LU et al., 2021; MA et al., 2017). Not only does CO₂ injection enhance the oil and gas recovery rate, but it also facilitates CO₂ geological storage, mitigates the global greenhouse effect, and aids China in reaching its “carbon peak, carbon neutral” goals. Therefore, the development of CO₂ injection shale oil technology has a broad application prospect and strategic significance.

At present, CO₂ enhanced oil recovery from shale mainly focuses on two aspects: shale core flooding test and numerical simulation of gas injection enhanced recovery (MEI et al., 2018; JIA et al., 2019; FAN et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022; Wan et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2023). In terms of experimental research, core-scale CO₂ shale oil replacement tests have been carried out (ALHARTH et al., 2018; ELWEGAA et al., 2019; FAKHER and IMQAM, 2020; LANG et al., 2021) and the results show that CO₂ injection can improve shale oil recovery. Moreover, the efficiency of this replacement process is influenced by factors such as the duration of CO₂ exposure, shale permeability, porosity, and the maturity of organic matter. Chen et al. (Cheng et al., 2014), Zhu et al. (ZHU et al., 2018) and Yu et al. (YU et al., 2021) adopted numerical simulations to show that volumetric fracturing penetrates the internal fractures of the reservoir, and then injecting CO₂ effectively improve the recovery rate. If CO₂ is directedly injected into the reservoir with low permeability, the recovery rate of shale oil is reduced. The existing studies focus on the impact of secondary fractures generated by fracturing on gas injection and oil recovery, while ignoring the impact of primary fractures widely present inside the reservoir.

Fractures in reservoirs profoundly affect fluid flow paths and mass transport. The models describing fluid flow in fractured rock are generally categorized into equivalent continuous models, discrete fracture network models, and discrete fracture-matrix models (GLÄSER et al., 2017; BERRE et al., 2019). Among them, the equivalent continuum model is subdivided into single-pore medium model, dual-pore medium model, and multi-pore medium model (BERRE et al., 2019). The assumptions of the single-pore medium model are based on the effective medium theory, which ignores the properties of the fracture network and calculates the effective permeability of the fracture network based on the shape, size, pore size and orientation distribution of the fracture as well as the matrix permeability. The dual-pores medium model and the multi-pore medium model mathematically describe the pores and fracture, and the fluid-mass balance equations are established within the fracture and matrix systems respectively. At any point in space, hydraulic parameters (permeability, porosity, etc.) have single or multiple values. Fracture-matrix interactions are represented by fluid exchange terms that incorporate microscale effects at the macroscale and do not geometrically characterize the fracture. Therefore, it is possible to carry out relevant studies directly using the method of simulating the flow in porous media (WANG et al., 2000; LIU and ZHANG, 2008; Yang et al., 2008). Currently, the common oil and gas numerical simulation software ECLIPSE, TOUGH2 and CMG are using equivalent continuous models (PRUESS et al., 1999; GUIDE, 2002; LAW et al., 2002; LAW et al., 2003; GeoQuest, 2010). Although this method is computationally efficient, it is more difficult to geometrically realize discrete fractures in porous media and their effects on local fluid paths. In the discrete fracture network and discrete fracture matrix models, the matrix and the fracture are treated as separate geometric objects, and the fracture region is explicitly created within the overall framework. The discrete-fracture model ignores the permeability of the matrix and considers only the fluid behavior in the fracture network. In the discrete fracture matrix model, diffusion, desorption, or two-phase seepage of the fluid within the matrix is ignored. Meanwhile, the model downscales to deal with fractures and explicitly constructs low-dimensional fractures. The discrete fracture matrix model allows the effect of fractures on the flow topology to be explicitly modeled compared to the dual-porosity and dual-permeability model in an equivalent continuous medium (KHOEI et al., 2016a; CHEN et al., 2017; ZHANG et al., 2017; MENG et al., 2018; CUSINI et al., 2021).

Based on the discrete fracture matrix model, this paper establishes a two-phase fluid flow model for CO₂ enhanced shale oil recovery. The model incorporates the two-phase seepage governing equations for CO₂ and shale oil, accounting for their behavior in both the porous regions and low-dimensional discrete fracture within the reservoir, including the fluid-mass transfer between the fractures and the pores. We apply this established model to a randomly fractured shale reservoir for numerical simulation purposes. Through this application, we analyze the effects of reservoir inhomogeneity, fracture permeability, CO₂ injection volume, and the injection scheme on the field, as well as on the efficiency and volume of shale oil extraction.

2 Mathematical model

The discrete fracture matrix model utilizes explicit low-dimensional interfaces to equivalently replace the high-dimensional regions occupied by fractures. The matrix and low-dimensional fractures are retained as separate geometric objects, and the discrete fracture network is explicitly modeled within the overall framework, as shown in Figure 1. The two-dimensional computational domain Ω is equivalently described as a two-dimensional matrix region Ωm and a one-dimensional fracture region Ωf. Therefore, the method is also known as mixed-dimensional or hybrid-dimensional discrete fracture model. The fracture computational domain contains any set of fully or partially interconnected fractures, and thus Ωf is expressed as Ωf = ∪fi, i being the total number of fractures. where ∂Ω is the boundary of the
computational domain, and \( r \) and \( n \) are the tangent and normal directions of the fractures.

### 2.1 Governing equations for two-phase flow

The basic assumptions of the mathematical model are as follows: 1) the fluid process is isothermal; 2) CO\(_2\) and shale oil are immiscible fluids; 3) the velocities of the free-state fluids in the matrix and the fracture satisfy Darcy’s law; 4) the mass exchange of CO\(_2\) and shale oil in the matrix and fracture satisfies the linear mass-transfer equations; and 5) the differential capillary pressure effect between the matrix and the fracture is neglected. Based on the above assumptions, the governing equations for the two-phase fluids of CO\(_2\) and shale oil in the reservoir matrix \( \Omega_m \) are expressed as (Zhang et al., 2017; Ma et al., 2021a):

\[
\begin{align*}
\phi^m \rho^m \frac{\partial p^m}{\partial t} + \left( \phi^m \rho^m - \phi^m \rho^m \phi^m c^m |p^m| \right) \frac{\partial \rho^m}{\partial t} &+ \nabla \cdot \left( -\frac{\rho^m k^m}{\mu^m} \nabla p^m \right) - \nabla \cdot \left( -\frac{\rho^m k^m}{\mu^m} |p^m|^2 \nabla \phi^m \right) = 0 \\
\phi^m \rho^m \frac{\partial p^m}{\partial t} - \phi^m \rho^m \frac{\partial \rho^m}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left( -\frac{\rho^m k^m}{\mu^m} \nabla p^m \right) & = 0
\end{align*}
\]

The two-phase flow in the reservoir fracture \( \Omega_f \) is expressed as (Law et al., 2003; MENG et al., 2018):

\[
\begin{align*}
d \phi^f S^f p^f c^f &\frac{\partial p^f}{\partial t} + d \left( \phi^f p^f - \phi^f S^f c^m |p^m| \right) \frac{\partial \rho^f}{\partial t} \\
&+ \nabla \cdot \left( -d \phi^f k^f \frac{k^f}{\mu^f} \nabla p^f \right) - \nabla \cdot \left( -d \phi^f k^f \frac{k^f}{\mu^f} |p^m|^2 \nabla \phi^f \right) \\
&= \left[ \rho^f u^f \cdot n \right] \\
d \phi^f S^f p^f c^f &\frac{\partial p^f}{\partial t} + d \phi^f \rho^f \frac{\partial \rho^f}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left( -d \phi^f k^f \frac{k^f}{\mu^f} \nabla p^f \right) \\
&= \left[ \rho^f u^f \cdot n \right]
\end{align*}
\]

where superscript \( a \in \{ m, f \} \) denotes matrix and fractures. Subscript \( \beta \in [o, g] \) denotes shale oil and CO\(_2\). \( \phi^a \) is the porosity, \( S^a_f \) is the fluid saturation, \( \rho^a_0 = -1/c^a_\beta (\partial p^a_0/\partial p^g_0) \) is the fluid density, \( c^a_\beta \) is the fluid compressibility coefficient, \( p^g_0 \) is the fluid pressure, and \( p^m_0 \) is the capillary pressure. Absolute permeability tensor \( k^a = k^a_1 \), \( k^a_\beta \) is the absolute permeability, \( I \) is the unit matrix, \( k^a_\beta \) is the relative permeability, \( \mu_\beta \) is the fluid viscosity; \( d_f \) is the fracture aperture. The source-sink term \([\rho^m_0 u^f \cdot n \cdot \nabla(p^f/p^m_0)]\) describes the jump in fluid normal flux in the matrix grids adjacent to the fracture, and the normal velocity of the fluid at the matrix grid is expressed as (Brenner et al., 2018):

\[
u^m_0 \cdot n = -\frac{k^m_o k^m_f}{\mu^m_\beta} \left( \frac{p^m_0 - p^g_0}{d_f/2} \right)
\]

The weak forms of the discontinuous Galerkin method for Equations 1, 2 are shown below (Ma et al., 2021a; MA et al., 2021b):

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{e \in \Omega_f} \int_{\partial e} \left[ \phi^m \rho^m \frac{\partial p^m}{\partial t} + \left( \phi^m \rho^m - \phi^m \rho^m \phi^m c^m |p^m| \right) \frac{\partial \rho^m}{\partial t} \right] \nabla g dV \\
+ \sum_{e \in \Omega_f} \int_{\partial e} \left( \lambda^o_\phi \left( |p^m|^2 \nabla \phi^m \right) - \left( \delta_{\phi_0} \left( |p^m|^2 \right) \right) \nabla g dV \\
- \sum_{e \in \Omega_f} \int_{\partial e} \left( \lambda^g_\phi \left( |p^m|^2 \right) \left( |p^m|^2 \right) \nabla g dV \right)
\end{align*}
\]

The weak form of the continuous Galerkin method in Equations 3, 4 is shown below (Ma et al., 2021b):

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{e \in \Omega_f} \int_{\partial e} \left[ d \phi^f S^f p^f c^f \frac{\partial p^f}{\partial t} + d \left( \phi^f p^f - \phi^f S^f c^f |p^m| \right) \frac{\partial \rho^f}{\partial t} \right] \nabla \phi^f dS \\
+ \sum_{e \in \Omega_f} \int_{\partial e} \left( d \phi^f p^f |\nabla \phi^f| - \delta_{\phi_0} \left( d \phi^f |p^m| \right) \right) \nabla \phi^f dS \\
= \sum_{e \in \Omega_f} \int_{\partial e} \left( d \phi^f S^f p^f c^f \frac{\partial p^f}{\partial t} - d \phi^f p^f \frac{\partial \rho^f}{\partial t} \right) \nabla \phi^f dS
\end{align*}
\]

where \( p^f_0 \) and \( \phi^f_0 \) are the trial functions, \( \delta_{\phi_0} = -\rho^m_0 k^m_\beta \). The penalization factor \( \delta_{\phi_0} \) is set to 0.01, and \( h \) is the grid size. The proposed model can consider the effect of low-permeability barriers on fluids, whereas we focus on high-permeability fractures. In other words, the fractures described herein have a...
higher permeability compared to the matrix, resulting in a relatively small gradient of pore pressure in the direction normal to the fracture. Thus, the pore pressures of matrix adjacent to the fractures is approximated equivalently as continuous when crossing the fracture.

2.2 Relative permeability and capillary pressure

The same relative permeability and capillary pressure models are selected for the matrix and fractures in shale reservoirs with the following expressions (MA et al., 2021a):

\[
k_{\alpha} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{S_{\alpha}} \left[ 1 - (1 - S_{\alpha}^{e}/\omega)\omega \right], & S_{\alpha} < 1 \\ 1, & S_{\alpha} > 1 \end{cases}
\]

(10)

\[
k_{\alpha} = \begin{cases} 1 - k_{\alpha}^{m}, & S_{\alpha} = 0 \\ (1 - S_{\alpha})^{2}, & S_{\alpha} > 0 \end{cases}
\]

(11)

\[
p^{\alpha} = p_{\alpha}^{m} - p_{\alpha}^{o} = p_{\alpha}^{0} (S_{\alpha} - S_{\alpha}^{e})^{\lambda}
\]

(12)

In the above equation, \( k_{\alpha}^{m} \) and \( k_{\alpha}^{o} \) are the relative permeability of shale oil and CO2; \( S_{\alpha}^{e} \) is the effective saturation; \( p_{\alpha}^{o} \) is the capillary pressure; \( \omega \) is the van Genuchten coefficient, and \( \lambda \) is the pore size distribution index.

2.3 Initial and boundary conditions

The initial conditions in the matrix and fractures of the shale reservoir are set as follows:

\[
p_{\alpha}^{m}(x, t = 0) = p_{\alpha}^{o}
\]

(13)

\[
S_{\alpha}(x, t = 0) = S_{\alpha}^{m}
\]

(14)

where \( p_{\alpha}^{o} \) and \( S_{\alpha}^{m} \) denote the initial CO2 pressure and oil phase saturation of the reservoir.

The production well is set up as Dirichlet boundary conditions with constant pore pressures and saturation, which are expressed as follows:

\[
p_{\alpha}(x, y) = p_{\alpha}^{o}
\]

(15)

\[
S_{\alpha}(x, y) = S_{\alpha}^{o}
\]

(16)

The injection well is set as a constant flow boundary:

\[
-p_{\alpha} k_{\alpha}^{w} \nabla p_{\alpha} = Q_{\alpha}
\]

(17)

where \( p_{\alpha}^{w} \) and \( S_{\alpha}^{w} \) are the CO2 pressure and oil-phase saturation at the production well, \( Q_{\alpha} \) is the CO2 injection volume.

The difference in initial values of the variables between the production well and the shale reservoir increases the nonlinear characteristics of the two-phase flow equations. To further improve the convergence and stability of the model, the method of adding penalty function is introduced in this study to set Dirichlet boundary conditions (MA et al., 2021a), then equations Eq. 15 and Eq. 16 are rewritten as:

\[
p_{\alpha}(x, y) = \int_{\partial \Omega} \lambda_{\alpha} \nabla p_{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n} \left( p_{\alpha} - p_{\alpha}^{w} \right) dS + \int_{\partial \Omega} \delta_{\alpha} \left( p_{\alpha} - p_{\alpha}^{w} \right) p_{\alpha}^{w} dS
\]

(18)

\[
S_{\alpha}(x, y) = \int_{\partial \Omega} \lambda_{\alpha} \left( \frac{p_{\alpha}}{p_{\alpha}^{m}} \right)^{\gamma} \nabla S_{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n} \left( S_{\alpha} - S_{\alpha}^{w} \right) dS + \int_{\partial \Omega} \delta_{\alpha} \left( S_{\alpha} - S_{\alpha}^{w} \right) S_{\alpha}^{w} dS
\]

(19)

3 Model implementation

We use ADFNE software to generate the coordinate information of random fractures. Subsequently, we utilize COMSOL Livelink in conjunction with MATLAB to import this random fracture information into the COMSOL Multiphysics software, allowing us to generate the corresponding geometric model. Following this, we incorporate the two-phase flow equations (6) to (9) for both pores and fractures into the built-in PDE weak form and low-dimensional PDE weak form modules of the COMSOL Multiphysics finite element software, respectively. We also set the model boundary and initial conditions. In the time domain, we choose to discretize the equations using the q-order backward difference method. For solving the nonlinear algebraic system, we select the MUMPS direct solver based on LU decomposition, applying the damped Newton method. To achieve higher computational accuracy, we set the relative tolerance to 0.001. The algorithm employs an adaptive approach for time discretization, in contrast to the pre-established time step method which selects time steps randomly. By default, this method initiates with the first step being 0.1% of the total end time.

4 Model validation

In this section, the model and its numerical results are validated through the McWhorter problem, in which the capillary effects of immiscible and incompressible two-phase flow in porous media are considered. The geometry, boundary and initial conditions of the model are shown in Figure 2. The length of the model is 2.6 m. At the initial moment, the simulated region is fully saturated by the non-wetting phase fluid and the reservoir pressure is 2 × 10^5 Pa. The left boundary has the water saturation of 1 and the pressure is 2 × 10^5 Pa, while the other boundaries are no-flow boundaries. Brooks-
Corey functions for capillary pressure and relative permeability are implemented in the model. The relevant parameter settings in the simulation are shown in Table 1. The comparisons between the semi-analytical solution of the McWhorter problem and the numerically calculated water saturation curves are given in Figure 3. The results show that the water is transported from the left boundary by about 1.5 m after 10,000 s. Meanwhile, the numerical and theoretical results match well, proving the applicability and accuracy of the numerical method in two-phase flow.

5 Model setup

Given the challenge of directly obtaining the distribution characteristics and attribute information of fractures within the reservoir, we employ the ADFNE program to generate two sets of two-dimensional random fractures (Alghalandis, 2017), with fracture lengths following an exponential distribution. The fractures are oriented at 45° and 135° to the horizontal direction, and the minimum and maximum values of the fracture lengths are 1 m and 5 m, respectively. The model is shown in Figure 4, and the 10 m × 10 m simulation geometry area is divided into about 4,700 triangular cells. The initial reservoir pressure $p^m_m$ of the model is 8 MPa and the initial saturation $S^m_m$ is 0.9, and the extraction well and gas injection well are placed in the upper right and lower left sections of the model, respectively. The pore pressure $p^g_m$ and saturation $S^g_m$ in the extraction wells are 4 MPa and 0.9, respectively, and the gas injection wells are set at a constant flow rate with a CO$_2$ injection of $1 \times 10^{-5}$ kg/m$^2$·s, and the rest of the boundaries are zero-flow boundaries. The whole simulation time is set to 600 days, and the basic physical parameters of the model are shown in Table 2.

6 Simulation results

Figures 5, 6 represent the spatial distribution of pore pressure ($p^m = p^g_m S^m_m + p^w_m S^w_m$) and CO$_2$ saturation at different time steps ($t = 50$th, 300th and 600th day) of CO$_2$ injection into the fractured reservoir for enhanced shale oil recovery, respectively. During shale oil extraction, pore pressures near

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>[m$^2$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity of wetting phase</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>[Pa·s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity of non-wetting phase</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>[Pa·s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of wetting phase</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>[kg/m$^3$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of non-wetting phase</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>[kg/m$^3$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry pressure</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>[Pa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative permeability parameter</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the gas injection wells increase, while those near the extraction wells decrease, resulting in an expanding range of pressure fluctuations. The higher permeability of the fractures, compared to the surrounding matrix, facilitates a more substantial flow of CO₂ into the interior of the reservoir along the fracture regions.
7 Sensitivity analysis

7.1 Effects of heterogeneity in shale reservoirs

In shale oil reservoirs, a considerable number of weak structural surfaces, such as laminae and natural fractures, are developed (JIN et al., 2021a; JIN et al., 2021b). Although fractures account for a small portion of the volume of the underlying shale oil reservoir, the fractures contribute to the heterogeneity of reservoir, profoundly affecting fluid transport and shale oil extraction efficiency (LEI et al., 2021). To accurately understand the impact of shale oil reservoirs heterogeneity properties on internal fluid transport, we investigate the effects of CO₂ injection into fractured and homogeneous reservoirs. Figures 7, 8 shows the distribution of reservoir pore pressure and CO₂ saturation along the monitoring line at different time steps (t = 50th, 300th and 600th day) during CO₂ injection into both the fractured and homogeneous reservoirs. The fractures enhance the overall permeability of the shale oil reservoir, increasing the mobility of both CO₂ and shale oil. As a result, the CO₂ saturation within the fractured reservoir at the same location is significantly higher than that in the homogeneous reservoir. Due to the lower permeability of matrix in the homogeneous reservoir, CO₂ tends to accumulate near the well, leading to slightly higher CO₂ saturation in its vicinity than at the wellhead of the fractured reservoir. The pore pressure near the injection well in the homogeneous reservoir is about 14.5 MPa at 600 days into the injection; however, in the fractured reservoir, the pore pressure near the injection well is about 20.1 MPa, due to the injection of a larger volume of CO₂.

Figure 9 illustrates the shale oil extraction rate and cumulative production resulting from CO₂ injection into both fractured and homogeneous reservoirs. At the outset of gas injection and production, the production rate of shale oil surges rapidly due to the significant pressure difference between the gas extraction well and the reservoir. During the process of production, the production rate of shale oil follows a general trend of increasing initially and then decreasing. On the 50th day of gas injection, the production rate of shale oil in the fractured reservoir experiences a rebound, attributable to the injection of a larger quantity of CO₂. By the 600th day of gas injection, the production rates of shale oil in the homogeneous and fractured reservoirs are approximately 0.09 kg/d and 0.17 kg/d, respectively, while the cumulative production amounts to approximately 60.8 kg and 90.4 kg, respectively. Throughout the entirety of the simulation process, the presence of natural fractures contributes to a 48.9% increase in the cumulative production of shale oil.

7.2 Effect of fracture permeability

Fracture permeability is typically one of the key factors influencing the efficiency of CO₂ enhanced shale oil recovery (ALFARGE et al., 2018; FENG et al., 2019). Here, we focus on analyzing the effect of fracture permeability on the behavior of fluid flow, as well as on shale oil recovery efficiency and production volume. Figures 10, 11 show the distribution of CO₂ saturation and pore pressure on the 600th day under different fracture permeability conditions ($k^f = 1.00 \times 10^{-14}, 1.00 \times 10^{-13}, 1.00 \times 10^{-12} m^2$).

Figures 12, 13 demonstrate the distribution of CO₂ saturation and pore pressure along the monitoring line, as well as the shale oil production rate and total production volume under different fracture permeability conditions. As fracture permeability increases, CO₂ is more readily able to penetrate into the interior of the reservoir, leading to an increase in both CO₂ saturation and reservoir pressure near the gas injection wells. A higher fracture permeability facilitates the flow of shale oil, enhancing the production rate and the total volume of shale oil produced. When the fracture permeability increases from $1.00 \times 10^{-14} m^2$ to $1.00 \times 10^{-13} m^2$, total shale oil production increases from 80.0 kg to 90.4 kg. However, as fracture permeability further increases from $1.00 \times 10^{-13} m^2$ to $1.00 \times 10^{-12} m^2$, the total shale oil production increases slightly, from 90.4 kg to 92.6 kg, amounting to an increase of 2.4%.
7.3 Effect of CO2 injection rate

Figures 14, 15 show the distribution of pore pressure and CO2 saturation along the monitoring line, as well as the shale oil extraction rate and total amount of production, under the conditions of CO2 injection rate \( (Q_g = 7.5 \times 10^{-6}, 1.5 \times 10^{-5}, 3.0 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{kg/m^2 \cdot s}) \). Given the same parameters and grid conditions, a larger CO2 injection rate results in a higher volume...
FIGURE 12
Distribution of pore pressure and CO₂ saturation along the monitoring line at t = 600th day with different fracture permeabilities.

FIGURE 13
Shale oil production rate and total production with different fracture permeabilities.

FIGURE 14
Distribution of pore pressure and CO₂ saturation along the monitoring line under different CO₂ injection rate conditions.
of CO₂ being injected into the reservoir at any given time. When
the injection rate increases from $7.5 \times 10^{-6}$ kg/m²·s to
$3.0 \times 10^{-5}$ kg/m²·s, the pressure near the injection well rises
from 9.88 MPa to 14.1 MPa, and the CO₂ saturation also
increases. Furthermore, a higher injection rate enhances the
efficiency of shale oil displacement, leading to an increase in
both the production rate and total extraction of shale oil. The
production efficiencies of the three scenarios are 0.14 kg/d,
0.17 kg/d and 0.22 kg/d, while the recoveries are 81.9 kg,
90.4 kg and 107.7 kg, respectively. The simulation results
indicate that a higher gas injection rate yields greater
production benefits. However, it is crucial to note that higher
pore pressure may increase the likelihood of damage or even
rupture in the reservoir and caprock. New fractures in the
caprock could provide pathways for CO₂ leakage, escalating
the risk of gas escape, diminishing the CO₂ sequestration
capacity of the reservoir, and potentially contaminating
groundwater, among other issues. Therefore, the mechanical
properties of both the reservoir and caprock warrant further
investigation.

### 7.4 Effect of different gas injection schemes

To examine the impact of various gas injection strategies,
three distinct cases are designed, as depicted in Figure 16. In
case 1, the CO₂ injection rate undergoes a stepwise reduction,
starting from $1.5 \times 10^{-5}$ kg and decreasing to $0.25 \times 10^{-5}$ kg. In case 2,
there is a stepwise increase in the CO₂ injection rate, ranging
from $0.25 \times 10^{-5}$ kg to $1.5 \times 10^{-5}$ kg. Lastly, Case 3 maintains a
constant CO₂ injection rate of $8.75 \times 10^{-6}$ kg throughout the
simulation. These designs ensure that the total gas injection
rate remains the same for all three schemes during the entire
simulation period.

The spatial distribution of CO₂ saturation at $t = 600$ days for
different gas injection schemes is illustrated in Figure 17. After
600 days of gas injection and extraction, the CO₂ distribution
within the shale reservoir is generally similar across all three
injection schemes. Figures 18, 19 highlight variations in pore
pressure, extraction rate, and total production near the
injection and production wells under different gas injection
scenarios. The pore pressures near the injection wellheads for
case 1 and 3 quickly peak at 13.5 MPa and 11.5 MPa,
respectively, at the onset of gas injection and extraction.
Thereafter, the pore pressure decreases under the influence
of the production wells. In Case 2, the pore pressure gradually increases to 10.2 MPa. Across all three injection
cases, the pore pressure near the production wells follows a
pattern of rapid decline followed by a rebound. In the middle
stage of extraction, case 1 exhibits the highest pore pressure and
extraction rate near the injection wells, while Case 2 has the
lowest. The total production in Case 1 surpasses that of the
other two cases, indicating that the choice of gas injection
influences shale oil production, even when the same amount
of CO₂ is injected. Therefore, optimizing the gas injection
scheme presents tangible economic benefits for enhancing
production capacity.
FIGURE 17
Distribution of CO₂ saturation at t = 600th day in different gas injection cases.

FIGURE 18
Evolution of pore pressure near injection and production wells in different gas injection cases.

FIGURE 19
Evolution of shale oil recovery rates and total production in different gas injection cases.
8 Conclusion

In this paper, we conducted a comprehensive analysis of the fluid dynamics and production characteristics of shale oil in response to CO2 injection. We presented the discrete fracture matrix model, incorporating both discontinuous and continuous Galerkin finite element methods. The main conclusions are drawn as follows:

1. Fractures in shale oil reservoirs play a crucial role in boosting both the efficiency of shale oil production and the production volumes. When compared to homogeneous reservoirs, fractured reservoirs exhibit an approximate 48.9% increase in cumulative shale oil production. Enhancing the permeability of fractures contributes to improved fluid flow capacity within the reservoir, subsequently fostering an increase in both the shale oil extraction rate and production volume. However, it is important to note that solely increasing the fracture permeability has a limited effect on augmenting the reservoir’s shale oil production capacity.

2. A higher CO2 injection rate enhances both the replacement efficiency and shale oil production. As the CO2 injection rate increases from $7.5 \times 10^{-6}$ kg/m²-s to $3.0 \times 10^{-5}$ kg/m²-s, the shale oil recovery rate improves from 0.14 kg/d to 0.22 kg/d, and the recovery volume increases from 82 kg to 109 kg. Furthermore, when considering the same total volume of CO2 injection, the chosen gas injection scheme significantly influences shale oil recovery. Simulation results indicate that gradually decreasing the CO2 injection rate yields more favorable outcomes for shale oil production compared to a constant flow rate injection.

3. Higher CO2 injection rates and a stepwise reduction in CO2 injection result in higher reservoir pore pressures, increasing the possibility of damage or even destruction of the rock near the well. New fractures created could cause CO2 leakage, which affects the overall gas injection effect and leads to environmental problems.

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusion of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Author contributions

TM: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Visualization, Writing—original draft. IJ: Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing—original draft.YL: Funding acquisition, Writing—review and editing, Writing—original draft. CG: Funding acquisition, Methodology, Writing—review and editing. WS: Investigation, Writing—review and editing. YX: Methodology, Writing—review and editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This study is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12202483, 12172362, 4200255 and 42372286), the Natural Science Foundation of Chongqing (cstc2021jcyj-msxmX0564), the Opening Fund from the State Key Laboratory of Gas Disaster Detecting, Preventing and Emergency Controlling (Grant No. 2021SKLKF04), PetroChina Innovation Foundation (No. 2021DQ02-0204), and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2022M713374), the Chinese Academy of Geological Sciences through Chinese Geological Survey Projects (DD20221819) and the Fund from SinoProbe Laboratory (SinoProbe Lab 202210).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher’s note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References


