# MACROSCOPIC CAPILLARITY AND HYSTERESIS FOR FLOW IN POROUS MEDIA

R. HILFER

ABSTRACT. A macroscopic theory for capillarity in porous media is presented challenging the established view that capillary pressure and relative permeability are constitutive parameter functions. The capillary pressure function in the present theory is not an input parameter but an outcome. The theoretical approach is based on introducing the residual saturations explicitly as state variables (as in Phys.Rev.E **58**, 2090 (1998)). Capillary pressure and relative permeability functions are predicted to exist for special cases. They exhibit hysteresis and process dependence as known from experiment.

## CONTENTS

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

*[1.1.1.1]* A predictive macroscopic theory of two phase flow inside a rigid porous medium is of fundamental importance for many applied sciences such as hydrology, catalysis, petrophysics or filtration technology [22, 24, 5, 1, 18, 8, 13, 12]. *[1.1.1.2]* Despite being used in innumerable physics and engineering applications the accepted theory (see below) based on capillary pressure $P_c$ and relative permeability functions $k^r$ lacks a sound theoretical foundation, and its basic parameter functions $P_c$ and $k^r$ are difficult to measure in experiment [1, 21, 8].

*[1.1.2.1]* Modern investigations often abandon the traditional theory and resort to microscopic models (e.g. network models) as an alternative to predict macroscopic immiscible displacement in porous media [7, 9, 6, 3, 2, 10]. *[1.1.2.2]* An important motivation for these alternative investigations are the unresolved problems with the traditional macroscopic theory based on capillary pressure and relative permeabilities and the necessity to relate these functions to pore scale parameters. *[1.1.2.3]* It is therefore adequate to remind the reader of the traditional theory, introduced more than 60 years ago [28, 23, 19], and its problems. *[1.1.2.4]* One formulation of the traditional theory starts from the fundamental balance laws of continuum mechanics for two fluids (called water $\mathbb{W}$ and oil $\mathbb{O}$) inside the pore space (called $\mathbb{P}$) of a porous sample $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{P} \cup \mathbb{M}$ with a rigid solid matrix (called $\mathbb{M}$). *[1.1.2.5]* Recall the law of mass balance in differential form

$$(1) \qquad \frac{\partial(\phi_i \varrho_i)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\phi_i \varrho_i \mathbf{v}_i) = M_i$$

where $\varrho_i(\mathbf{x}, t), \phi_i(\mathbf{x}, t), \mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$ denote mass density, volume fraction and velocity of phase $i = \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{O}$ as functions of position $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. *[1.1.2.6]* Exchange of mass between the two phases is described by mass transfer rates $M_i$ giving the amount of mass by which phase $i$ changes per unit time and volume. *[1.1.2.7]* Momentum balance for the two fluids requires in addition

$$(2) \qquad \phi_i \varrho_i \frac{\mathrm{D}^i}{\mathrm{D}t} \mathbf{v}_i - \phi_i \nabla \cdot \Sigma_i - \phi_i \mathbf{F}_i = \mathbf{m}_i - \mathbf{v}_i M_i$$

where $\Sigma_i$ is the stress tensor in the $i$th phase, $\mathbf{F}_i$ is the body force per unit volume acting on the $i$th phase, $\mathbf{m}_i$ is the momentum transfer into phase $i$ from all the other phases, and $\mathrm{D}^i/\mathrm{D}t = \partial/\partial t + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla$ denotes the material derivative for phase $i = \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{O}$.

*[1.2.1.1]* Defining the saturations $S_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$ as the volume fraction of pore space $\mathbb{P}$ filled with phase $i$ one has the relation $\phi_i = \phi S_i$ where $\phi$ is the porosity of the sample. *[1.2.1.2]* Expressing volume conservation $\phi_\mathbb{W} + \phi_\mathbb{O} = \phi$ in terms of saturations yields

$$(3) \qquad S_\mathbb{W} + S_\mathbb{O} = 1.$$

*[1.2.1.3]* In order to get the traditional theory these balance laws for mass, momentum and volume have to be combined with specific constitutive assumptions for $M_i, \mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{F}_i$ and $\Sigma_i$.

*[1.2.2.1]* Great simplification is afforded by assuming that the porous medium is macroscopically homogeneous

$$(4) \qquad \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \phi = \text{const}$$

although this assumption can be relaxed, and is rarely valid in practice [17]. *[1.2.2.2]* Let us further assume that the fluids are incompressible so that

$$(5a) \qquad \varrho_\mathbb{W}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \varrho_\mathbb{W}$$
$$(5b) \qquad \varrho_\mathbb{O}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \varrho_\mathbb{O}$$

where the constants $\varrho_\mathbb{W}, \varrho_\mathbb{O}$ are independent of $\mathbf{x}$ and $t$. *[1.2.2.3]* One assumes next that the stress tensor of the fluids is diagonal

$$(6a) \qquad \Sigma_\mathbb{W} = -P_\mathbb{W} \mathbf{1}$$
$$(6b) \qquad \Sigma_\mathbb{O} = -P_\mathbb{O} \mathbf{1}$$

where $P_\mathbb{W}, P_\mathbb{O}$ are the fluid pressures. *[1.2.2.4]* Realistic subsurface flows have low Reynolds numbers so that the inertial term

$$(7) \qquad \frac{\mathrm{D}^i}{\mathrm{D}t} \mathbf{v}_i = 0$$

*[page 2, §0]* can be neglected in the momentum balance equation (2). *[2.0.0.1]* It is further assumed that the body forces

$$(8a) \qquad \mathbf{F}_\mathbb{W} = \varrho_\mathbb{W} \mathbf{g}$$
$$(8b) \qquad \mathbf{F}_\mathbb{O} = \varrho_\mathbb{O} \mathbf{g}$$

are given by gravity. *[2.0.0.2]* As long as there are no chemical reactions between the fluids the mass transfer rates vanish, so that

$$(9) \qquad M_\mathbb{W} = -M_\mathbb{O} = 0$$

holds. *[2.0.0.3]* Momentum transfer between the fluids and the rigid matrix is governed by viscous drag in the form

$$(10a) \qquad \mathbf{m}_\mathbb{W} = -\frac{\mu_\mathbb{W} \, \phi_\mathbb{W}^2}{k \, k_\mathbb{W}^r(S_\mathbb{W})} \mathbf{v}_\mathbb{W}$$

$$(10b) \qquad \mathbf{m}_\mathbb{O} = -\frac{\mu_\mathbb{O} \, \phi_\mathbb{O}^2}{k \, k_\mathbb{O}^r(S_\mathbb{W})} \mathbf{v}_\mathbb{O}$$

where $\mu_\mathbb{W}, \mu_\mathbb{O}$ are the constant fluid viscosities, $k$ is the absolute permeability, and $k_\mathbb{W}^r(S_\mathbb{W}), k_\mathbb{O}^r(S_\mathbb{W})$ are the so called relative permeabilities of water and oil.

*[2.0.1.1]* Inserting the constitutive assumptions (4)–(10) into the mass balance eqs. (1) yields

$$(11a) \quad \frac{\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (S_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}}) = 0$$

$$(11b) \quad \frac{\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (S_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}}) = 0$$

while the momentum balance eqs. (2)

$$(12a) \quad \phi_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}} = -\frac{k}{\mu_{\mathbb{W}}} k_{\mathbb{W}}^r(S_{\mathbb{W}})(\nabla P_{\mathbb{W}} - \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g})$$

$$(12b) \quad \phi_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}} = -\frac{k}{\mu_{\mathbb{O}}} k_{\mathbb{O}}^r(S_{\mathbb{W}})(\nabla P_{\mathbb{O}} - \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g})$$

give the generalized Darcy laws for the Darcy velocities $\phi_i\mathbf{v}_i$ [24, p. 155]. *[2.0.1.2]* The relative permeabilities $k_{\mathbb{W}}^r(S_{\mathbb{W}})$, $k_{\mathbb{O}}^r(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ are assumed to be nonlinear constitutive parameter functions. *[2.0.1.3]* They account for the fact, that the permability of the two immiscible fluids deviates from their partial permeabilities $kS_{\mathbb{W}}$, $kS_{\mathbb{O}}$ obtained from volume averaging of the absolute permeability.

*[2.0.2.1]* Equations (11) and (12) together with eq. (3) provide 9 equations for 10 unknowns $S_{\mathbb{W}}, S_{\mathbb{O}}, P_{\mathbb{W}}, P_{\mathbb{O}}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}}$. *[2.0.2.2]* An additional equation is needed. *[2.0.2.3]* Based on the work of Smith on capillary rise in regular packings [26] it was argued in Ref. [19] that the pressure difference between oil and water should in general depend only on saturation

$$(13) \quad P_{\mathbb{O}} - P_{\mathbb{W}} = \sigma_{\mathbb{WO}}\kappa(S_{\mathbb{W}}) = P_c(S_{\mathbb{W}})$$

where $\sigma_{\mathbb{WO}}$ is the oil-water interfacial tension and $\kappa(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ is the mean curvature of the oil-water interface. *[2.0.2.4]* This assumption has remained the cornerstone of the theory of macroscopic capillarity for 60 years, and it is being challenged here. *[2.1.0.5]* The nonlinear constitutive parameter function $P_c(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ is called the capillary pressure-saturation relation and it is supposed to describe the macroscopic effect of capillarity in hydrostatic equilibrium (without flow). *[2.1.0.6]* In practice the $P_c$-curve is often parametrized in the so called van-Genuchten parametrization by five parameters consisting of two limiting saturations, two exponents and one pressure prefactor [12]. *[2.1.0.7]* The traditional theory requires 5+4+3=12 parameters to parametrize a bounding hysteresis loop consisting of two drainage and one imbibition curve.

*[2.1.1.1]* This concludes my presentation of the traditional theory. *[2.1.1.2]* Equations (3),(11),(12) and (13) appropriately supplemented with initial and boundary conditions constitute the traditional theory of macroscopic capillarity in porous media. *[2.1.1.3]* In numerous engineering applications eqs.(3),(11),(12) and (13) are solved by computer programs [12].

*[2.1.2.1]* Serious problems limit the predictive power of equations (3),(11), (12) and (13). *[2.1.2.2]* The biggest problem arises from eq. (13), because it is not unique and does not account for residual saturations. *[2.1.2.3]* It is tacitly assumed that fluids trapped in pendular rings, ganglia or blobs behave in the same way as fluids that percolate to the sample surface. *[2.1.2.4]* Moreover, combining eq. (13) with eq. (12) implies that in static equilibrium, when $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}} = 0 = \mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}}$, the pressure is everywhere hydrostatic, even in the trapped fluids. *[2.1.2.5]* This is clearly not the case.

*[2.1.3.1]* Other problems with $P_c(S_{\mathbb{W}})$, $k_{\mathbb{W}}^r(S_{\mathbb{W}})$, and $k_{\mathbb{O}}^r(S_{\mathbb{O}})$ are multivaluedness, hysteresis, and dynamic effects. *[2.1.3.2]* Equation (13) is also problematic because it seems to identify a pressure defined on the pore scale with a macroscopically averaged pressure.

*[2.1.4.1]* Most practitioners ignore these problems and continue to use the traditional set of equations. *[2.1.4.2]* Many physicists on the other hand try to overcome these problems by resorting to microscopic model calculations in an attempt to predict macroscopic behaviour starting from the pore scale or below [7, 20]. *[2.1.4.3]* My objective in this paper is to present a purely macroscopic approach in the same spirit as the traditional theory, but without requiring capillary pressure $P_c$ or relative permeabilities as input parameters. *[2.1.4.4]* The approach followed here is to modify the constitutive assumptions (4)–(10) based on the insight that the main effect of capillarity is the distinction between percolating and nonpercolating (trapped) fluid phases [14, 16, 15]. *[2.1.4.5]* The fluids flow hydrodynamically in the percolating regions while the trapped fluids are kept in place by capillary forces. Trapped fluid can only move by viscous drag or through coalescence with percolating fluid regions.

*[2.1.5.1]* Before defining percolating and nonpercolating fluid phases in the next section, it is appropriate to comment on the relation to other approaches. *[2.1.5.2]* Firstly, several authors (including the present one) have emphasized the importance of introducing the fluid-fluid surface area as a state variable (see [14, 16, 15] and references therein). *[2.1.5.3]* The present approach differs from such theories. *[2.1.5.4]* The present theory is based only on volume fractions. *[2.1.5.5]* It avoids surface area and its concomitant proliferation of unknowns and constitutive relations. *[2.1.5.6]* Secondly, some models generalize eq. (13) into a so called dynamic capillary pressure by including a dependence on rates of saturation change (see e.g. [11] and references therein). *[2.1.5.7]* The present approach includes dynamic (or viscous) effects on capillarity *[page 3, §0]* in a more fundamental way by avoiding the concept of capillary pressure. *[3.0.0.1]* Thirdly, there exist several

ad-hoc models for hysteresis loops based on rescaling the main loop formed by the bounding drainage and imbibition curves (see e.g. [27] and references therein). *[3.0.0.2]* Again, such approaches differ fundamentally from the present one, because they are based on the traditional concepts of capillary pressure and relative peremeability, while the present approach challenges the basis of these concepts. *[3.0.0.3]* It will be seen below that the present theory requires fewer parameters than previous theories.

## 2. PERCOLATING VERSUS NONPERCOLATING FLUID REGIONS

*[3.0.1.1]* The necessity to distinguish between percolating and nonpercolating fluid regions arises from the fact that in static equilibrium the pressure can become hydrostatic only in those fluid regions that are connected (or percolating) to the sample boundary [14, 16, 15]. *[3.0.1.2]* Each of the two fluids $\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{O}$ consists of disjoint and pathconnected subsets (regions) $\mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{O}_i$. *[3.0.1.3]* More precisely one has

$$(14a) \quad \mathbb{W} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_{\mathbb{W}}} \mathbb{W}_i$$

$$(14b) \quad \mathbb{O} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_{\mathbb{O}}} \mathbb{O}_i$$

where the subsets $\mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{O}_i$ are mutually disjoint, and each of them is pathconnected. *[3.0.1.4]* A set is called pathconnected if any two of its points can be connected by a path contained inside the set. *[3.0.1.5]* The sets are called mutually disjoint if $\mathbb{O}_i \cap \mathbb{O}_j = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{W}_i \cap \mathbb{W}_j = \emptyset$ holds for all $i \neq j$. *[3.0.1.6]* The integers $N_{\mathbb{W}}, N_{\mathbb{O}}$ give the total number of pathconnected subsets for water resp. oil. *[3.0.1.7]* Of course, these numbers change with time as do the regions $\mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{O}_i$.

*[3.0.2.1]* Now define percolating $(\mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{F}_3)$ and nonpercolating $(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_4)$ fluid regions by classifying the subsets $\mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{O}_i$ as to whether they have empty or nonempty intersection with the sample boundary $\partial\mathbb{S}$. *[3.1.0.2]* More formally, define

$$(15a) \quad \mathbb{F}_1 = \bigcup_{\substack{i=1 \\ \partial\mathbb{W}_i \cap \partial\mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset}}^{N_{\mathbb{W}}} \mathbb{W}_i$$

$$(15b) \quad \mathbb{F}_2 = \bigcup_{\substack{i=1 \\ \partial\mathbb{W}_i \cap \partial\mathbb{S} = \emptyset}}^{N_{\mathbb{W}}} \mathbb{W}_i$$

$$(15c) \quad \mathbb{F}_3 = \bigcup_{\substack{i=1 \\ \partial\mathbb{O}_i \cap \partial\mathbb{S} \neq \emptyset}}^{N_{\mathbb{O}}} \mathbb{O}_i$$

$$(15d) \quad \mathbb{F}_4 = \bigcup_{\substack{i=1 \\ \partial\mathbb{O}_i \cap \partial\mathbb{S} = \emptyset}}^{N_{\mathbb{O}}} \mathbb{O}_i$$

so that $\mathbb{F}_1$ is the union of all regions $\mathbb{W}_i$, and is $\mathbb{F}_3$ the union of all regions $\mathbb{O}_i$, that have nonempty intersection with the sample boundary $\partial\mathbb{S}$. *[3.1.0.3]* Similarly $\mathbb{F}_2$ is the union of all regions $\mathbb{W}_i$ that have empty intersection with $\partial\mathbb{S}$, and similarly for $\mathbb{F}_4$. *[3.1.0.4]* In this way each point in $\mathbb{P}$ belongs to one of four regions $\mathbb{F}_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. *[3.1.0.5]* This results in a total of four fluid phases called percolating resp. nonpercolating water, and percolating resp. nonpercolating oil. *[3.1.0.6]* The index $i = 5$ will be used for the rigid matrix (=rock).

## 3. FORMULATION OF THE MODEL

3.1. **General balance laws.** *[3.1.1.1]* The approach presented here is based on the traditional theory presented in Section 1 combined with the distinction between percolating and nonpercolating phases introduced in Refs. [14, 16, 15] and discussed in Section 2. *[3.1.1.2]* The volume fractions of the subsets $\mathbb{F}_i \subset \mathbb{S}, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $\mathbb{M} \subset \mathbb{S}$ are denoted as $\phi_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$. *[3.1.1.3]* Let $\phi$ denote the porosity (volume fraction of $\mathbb{P}$). *[3.1.1.4]* Volume conservation implies the relations

$$(16a) \quad \phi_1 + \phi_2 + \phi_3 + \phi_4 + \phi_5 = 1$$

$$(16b) \quad S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_4 = 1$$

$$(16c) \quad 1 - \phi = \phi_5$$

where $\phi_i = \phi S_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ are volume fractions, and $S_i$ are saturations. *[3.1.1.5]* The water saturation is defined as $S_{\mathbb{W}} = S_1 + S_2$ and the oil saturation as $S_{\mathbb{O}} = S_3 + S_4$.

*[3.1.2.1]* The general law of mass balance is again given by eq. (1) with $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. *[3.1.2.2]* It provides now four equations instead of two. *[3.1.2.3]* The general law of momentum balance is given by eq. (2), also now with $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ instead of $i = \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{O}$ as before.

3.2. **General constitutive assumptions.** *[3.1.3.1]* As in the traditional theory the porous medium is again assumed to be macroscopically homogeneous so that eq. (4) holds. *[3.1.3.2]* The flows are slow, and hence also eq. (7) continues to hold without change. *[3.1.3.3]* For

incompressible fluids one has now

(17a)   $\varrho_1(\mathbf{x}, t) = \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}$

(17b)   $\varrho_2(\mathbf{x}, t) = \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}$

(17c)   $\varrho_3(\mathbf{x}, t) = \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}$

(17d)   $\varrho_4(\mathbf{x}, t) = \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}$

analogous to eq. (5a).

### 3.3. Viscous drag. [3.1.4.1] The momentum transfer into phase $i$ from all the other phases is assumed to be a simple viscous drag,

(18)   $\mathbf{m}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{5} R_{ij}(\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i)$

where the resistance coefficient $R_{ij}$ quantifies the viscous coupling between phase $i$ and $j$. [3.1.4.2] For the rigid rock matrix [page 4, §0] $\mathbf{v}_5 = 0$. [4.0.0.1] Hence $-R_{i5}\mathbf{v}_i$ is the momentum transfer from the wall into phase $i$. [4.0.0.2] Then

(19a)   $\mathbf{m}_1 = R_{13}(\mathbf{v}_3 - \mathbf{v}_1) + R_{14}(\mathbf{v}_4 - \mathbf{v}_1) - R_{15}\mathbf{v}_1$

(19b)   $\mathbf{m}_2 = R_{23}(\mathbf{v}_3 - \mathbf{v}_2) + R_{24}(\mathbf{v}_4 - \mathbf{v}_2) - R_{25}\mathbf{v}_2$

(19c)   $\mathbf{m}_3 = R_{31}(\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_3) + R_{32}(\mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{v}_3) - R_{35}\mathbf{v}_3$

(19d)   $\mathbf{m}_4 = R_{41}(\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_4) + R_{42}(\mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{v}_4) - R_{45}\mathbf{v}_4$

where $R_{12} = 0$ and $R_{34} = 0$ was used because there is no common interface and hence no direct viscous interaction between these phase pairs. [4.0.0.3] Each $R_{ij}$ is a $3 \times 3$-matrix.

### 3.4. Capillarity. [4.0.1.1] In the present approach the body forces are given by gravity plus capillary forces

(20a)   $\mathbf{F}_1 = \varrho_1 \mathbf{g}$

(20b)   $\mathbf{F}_2 = \varrho_2 \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_{c\mathbb{W}}$

(20c)   $\mathbf{F}_3 = \varrho_3 \mathbf{g}$

(20d)   $\mathbf{F}_4 = \varrho_4 \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_{c\mathbb{O}}$

contrary to eqs. (8). [4.0.1.2] The capillary body forces $\mathbf{F}_{c\mathbb{W}}, \mathbf{F}_{c\mathbb{O}}$ are responsible for keeping the trapped fluids inside the medium. [4.0.1.3] They are obtained as gradients of capillary potentials

(21a)   $\mathbf{F}_{c\mathbb{W}} = -\nabla\Pi_{c\mathbb{W}}$

(21b)   $\mathbf{F}_{c\mathbb{O}} = -\nabla\Pi_{c\mathbb{O}}$

where the capillary potentials $\Pi_{c\mathbb{W}}, \Pi_{c\mathbb{O}}$ are defined as

(22a)   $\Pi_{c\mathbb{W}} = \Pi_a^* - \Pi_a S_1^{-\alpha}$

(22b)   $\Pi_{c\mathbb{O}} = \Pi_b^* - \Pi_b S_3^{-\beta}$

with constants $\Pi_a^*, \Pi_b^*, \Pi_a, \Pi_b$ and exponents $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

[4.0.2.1] Next the stress tensor for percolating phases can be specified in analogy with eq. (6) as

(23a)   $\Sigma_1 = -P_1 \mathbf{1}$

(23b)   $\Sigma_3 = -P_3 \mathbf{1}$

where $P_1$ and $P_3$ are the fluid pressures. [4.0.2.2] The stress tensor $\Sigma_2, \Sigma_4$ for the nonpercolating phases cannot be specified in the same way because the forces cannot propagate in nonpercolating phases. [4.0.2.3] Here it is assumed that these stresses are given by the pressure in the surrounding percolating phase modified by the energy density stored in the common interface with the surrounding percolating phases. [4.0.2.4] This suggests an Ansatz [4]

(24a)   $\Sigma_2 = -P_3 \mathbf{1} + \dfrac{\sigma_{\mathbb{W}\mathbb{O}}}{\phi} \dfrac{\partial A_{32}}{\partial S_2} \mathbf{1}$

(24b)   $\Sigma_4 = -P_1 \mathbf{1} + \dfrac{\sigma_{\mathbb{W}\mathbb{O}}}{\phi} \dfrac{\partial A_{41}}{\partial S_4} \mathbf{1}$

where $\sigma_{\mathbb{W}\mathbb{O}}$ is the oil-water interfacial tension, and the unknowns $A_{32}(\mathbf{x}, t), A_{41}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are the interfacial areas per unit volume of porous medium between phases 3 and 2, resp. 4 and 1. [4.1.0.5] (The factor $\phi$ arises from the definition of $A_{ij}$ per unit volume of porous medium.) [4.1.0.6] To avoid equations of motion for the unknowns $A_{32}$ and $A_{41}$ it is assumed that geometrical relations of the form

(25a)   $A_{32} = A_2^* S_2^{\gamma}$

(25b)   $A_{41} = A_4^* S_4^{\delta}$

hold, where $A_2^*, A_4^*$ are prefactors assumed to be constant. [4.1.0.7] Thus for the nonpercolating phases

(26a)   $\Sigma_2 = (-P_3 + \gamma P_2^* S_2^{\gamma-1})\mathbf{1}$

(26b)   $\Sigma_4 = (-P_1 + \delta P_4^* S_4^{\delta-1})\mathbf{1}$

will be used below. [4.1.0.8] Here

(27a)   $P_2^* = A_2^* \dfrac{\sigma_{\mathbb{W}\mathbb{O}}}{\phi}$

(27b)   $P_4^* = A_4^* \dfrac{\sigma_{\mathbb{W}\mathbb{O}}}{\phi}$

are constants.

[4.1.1.1] The mass transfer rates must depend on rates of saturation change. [4.1.1.2] They are here assumed to be

(28a)   $M_1 = -M_2 = \eta_2 \phi \varrho_{\mathbb{W}} \left( \dfrac{S_2 - S_2^*}{S_{\mathbb{W}}^* - S_{\mathbb{W}}} \right) \dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}}{\partial t}$

(28b)   $M_3 = -M_4 = \eta_4 \phi \varrho_{\mathbb{O}} \left( \dfrac{S_4 - S_4^*}{S_{\mathbb{O}}^* - S_{\mathbb{O}}} \right) \dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}}{\partial t}$

where $\eta_2, \eta_4$ are constants. *[4.1.1.3]* The parameters $S_{\mathbb{W}}{}^*, S_{\mathbb{O}}{}^*, S_2{}^*, S_4{}^*$ are defined by

(29a) $\quad S_{\mathbb{W}}{}^* = \dfrac{1 - S_{\mathbb{O}\,\mathrm{im}}}{2}\left[1 + \tanh\left(\tau_{\mathbb{W}}\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}}{\partial t}\right)\right]$

$\qquad\qquad + \dfrac{S_{\mathbb{W}\,\mathrm{dr}}}{2}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\tau_{\mathbb{W}}\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}}{\partial t}\right)\right]$

(29b) $\quad S_{\mathbb{O}}{}^* = \dfrac{1 - S_{\mathbb{W}\,\mathrm{dr}}}{2}\left[1 + \tanh\left(\tau_{\mathbb{O}}\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}}{\partial t}\right)\right]$

$\qquad\qquad + \dfrac{S_{\mathbb{O}\,\mathrm{im}}}{2}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\tau_{\mathbb{O}}\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}}{\partial t}\right)\right]$

(29c) $\quad S_2{}^* = \dfrac{S_{\mathbb{W}\,\mathrm{dr}}}{2}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\tau_2\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}}{\partial t}\right)\right]$

(29d) $\quad S_4{}^* = \dfrac{S_{\mathbb{O}\,\mathrm{im}}}{2}\left[1 - \tanh\left(\tau_4\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}}{\partial t}\right)\right]$

*[page 5, §0]* where $S_{\mathbb{W}\,\mathrm{dr}}, S_{\mathbb{O}\,\mathrm{im}}$ are limiting saturations for $S_2, S_4$ and $\tau_{\mathbb{W}}, \tau_{\mathbb{O}}, \tau_2, \tau_4$ are equilibration time scales for reaching capillary equilibrium. *[5.0.0.1]* For simplicity

(30) $\qquad \tau = \tau_{\mathbb{W}} = \tau_{\mathbb{O}} = \tau_2 = \tau_4$

will be assumed below.

## 4. IDENTIFICATION OF CAPILLARY PRESSURE

4.1. **Hydrostatic equilibrium.** *[5.0.1.1]* The constitutive theory proposed above, contrary to the traditional theory, does not postulate a unique capillary pressure as a constitutive parameter function. *[5.0.1.2]* On the other hand experimental evidence suggests that capillary pressure is a useful concept to correlate observations. *[5.0.1.3]* To make contact with the established traditional theory it is therefore important to check whether the traditional $P_{\mathrm{c}}(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ relation can be viewed as a derived concept within the new theory.

*[5.0.2.1]* Consider first the case of hydrostatic equilibrium where $\mathbf{v}_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. *[5.0.2.2]* In hydrostatic equilibrium all fluids are at rest. *[5.0.2.3]* In this case the traditional theory implies $\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}/\partial t = 0$ and $\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}/\partial t = 0$, by mass balance eq. (11). *[5.0.2.4]* The traditional momentum balance eqs. (12) can be integrated to give

(31a) $\quad P_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x}) = P_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g}\cdot(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$

(31b) $\quad P_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathbf{x}) = P_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g}\cdot(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$

where $\mathbf{x}_0$ is a point in the boundary. *[5.0.2.5]* Combined with the assumption (13) one finds

(32) $\quad P_{\mathrm{c}}(S_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x})) = P_{\mathbb{O}}(\mathbf{x}) - P_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x})$

$\qquad\qquad\qquad = P_{\mathrm{c}0} + (\varrho_{\mathbb{O}} - \varrho_{\mathbb{W}})\mathbf{g}\cdot(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$

implying the existence of a unique hydrostatic saturation profile $S_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x})$. *[5.0.2.6]* Here $P_{\mathrm{c}0} = P_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is the capillary pressure at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_0$. *[5.0.2.7]* Experiments show, however, that hydrostatic saturation profiles are

not unique. *[5.0.2.8]* As a consequence the traditional theory employs multiple $P_{\mathrm{c}}(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ relations for drainage and imbibition, and this leads to difficult problems when imbibition and drainage occur simultaneously.

*[5.0.3.1]* The nonlinear theory proposed here can be solved in the special case of hydrostatic equilibrium. *[5.0.3.2]* Mass balance (1) now implies $\partial S_i/\partial t = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. *[5.0.3.3]* Integrating eqs. (2) yields

(33a) $\quad P_1(\mathbf{x}) = P_1(\mathbf{x}_0) + \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g}\cdot(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$

(33b) $\quad P_3(\mathbf{x}) = P_3(\mathbf{x}_0) + \Pi_{\mathrm{a}}\left(S_1(\mathbf{x})^{-\alpha} - S_1(\mathbf{x}_0)^{-\alpha}\right)$

$\qquad\qquad + \gamma P_2^*\left(S_2(\mathbf{x})^{\gamma-1} - S_2(\mathbf{x}_0)^{\gamma-1}\right)$

$\qquad\qquad + \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g}\cdot(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$

(33c) $\quad P_3(\mathbf{x}) = P_3(\mathbf{x}_0) + \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g}\cdot(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$

(33d) $\quad P_1(\mathbf{x}) = P_1(\mathbf{x}_0) + \Pi_{\mathrm{b}}\left(S_3(\mathbf{x})^{-\beta} - S_3(\mathbf{x}_0)^{-\beta}\right)$

$\qquad\qquad + \delta P_4^*\left(S_4(\mathbf{x})^{\delta-1} - S_4(\mathbf{x}_0)^{\delta-1}\right)$

$\qquad\qquad + \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g}\cdot(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$

If one identifies $P_1$ with $P_{\mathbb{W}}$ and $P_3$ with $P_{\mathbb{O}}$ then eqs. (33a) and (33b) suggest to identify $P_{\mathrm{c}}$ as $P_3 - P_1$. *[5.1.0.4]* Then eqs. (33c) and (33d) combined with $S_1 = S_{\mathbb{W}} - S_2$ and $S_3 = 1 - S_{\mathbb{W}} - S_4$ imply $P_{\mathrm{c}} = P_{\mathrm{c}}(S_{\mathbb{W}}, S_2, S_4)$. *[5.1.0.5]* The capillary pressure $P_{\mathrm{c}}$ depends not only on $S_{\mathbb{W}}$ but also on $S_2$ and $S_4$ in hydrostatic equilibrium. *[5.1.0.6]* In the theory proposed here it is not possible to identify a unique $P_{\mathrm{c}}(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ relation when all fluids are at rest. This agrees with experiment.

4.2. **Residual decoupling approximation.** *[5.1.1.1]* While it is not possible to identify a unique $P_{\mathrm{c}}(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ relation in hydrostatic equilibrium such a functional relation emerges nevertheless from the present theory when the system approaches hydrostatic equilibrium in the *residual decoupling approximation*. *[5.1.1.2]* The approach to hydrostatic equilibrium in the residual decoupling approximation (RDA) can be formulated mathematically as $\mathbf{v}_4 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ and $R_{23} = 0, R_{41} = 0$. *[5.1.1.3]* In addition it is assumed that the velocities $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_3 \to 0$ are small but nonzero. *[5.1.1.4]* In the RDA mass balance becomes

(34a) $\quad \dfrac{\partial S_1}{\partial t} + \nabla\cdot(S_1\mathbf{v}_1) = \eta_2\left(\dfrac{S_2 - S_2{}^*}{S_{\mathbb{W}}{}^* - S_{\mathbb{W}}}\right)\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}}{\partial t}$

(34b) $\quad \dfrac{\partial S_2}{\partial t} = -\eta_2\left(\dfrac{S_2 - S_2{}^*}{S_{\mathbb{W}}{}^* - S_{\mathbb{W}}}\right)\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}}{\partial t}$

(34c) $\quad \dfrac{\partial S_3}{\partial t} + \nabla\cdot(S_3\mathbf{v}_3) = \eta_4\left(\dfrac{S_4 - S_4{}^*}{S_{\mathbb{O}}{}^* - S_{\mathbb{O}}}\right)\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}}{\partial t}$

(34d) $\quad \dfrac{\partial S_4}{\partial t} = -\eta_4\left(\dfrac{S_4 - S_4{}^*}{S_{\mathbb{O}}{}^* - S_{\mathbb{O}}}\right)\dfrac{\partial S_{\mathbb{O}}}{\partial t}$

Momentum balance becomes in the RDA

$$(35a) \quad \phi_1(\nabla P_1 - \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g}) = R_{13}\mathbf{v}_3 - (R_1 + M_1)\mathbf{v}_1$$

$$(35b) \quad 0 = \phi_2(\nabla P_3 + \nabla\Pi_{c\mathbb{W}} - \gamma P_2^*\nabla S_2^{\gamma-1} - \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g})$$

$$(35c) \quad \phi_3(\nabla P_3 - \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g}) = R_{31}\mathbf{v}_1 - (R_3 + M_3)\mathbf{v}_3$$

$$(35d) \quad 0 = \phi_4(\nabla P_1 + \nabla\Pi_{c\mathbb{O}} - \delta P_4^*\nabla S_4^{\delta-1} - \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g})$$

where the abbreviations

$$(36a) \quad R_1 = R_{13} + R_{14} + R_{15}$$

$$(36b) \quad R_3 = R_{31} + R_{32} + R_{35}$$

were used. *[5.1.1.5]* Equations (34) and (35) together with eq.(16b) provide 17 equations for 12 variables ($P_1, P_3, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_3$ and $S_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$).

*[5.1.2.1]* Equations (34) and (35) can now be compared to the traditional equations (11)–(13) with the aim of identifying capillary pressure and relative permeability. *[5.1.2.2]* Consider first the momentum balance eqs. (35). *[5.1.2.3]* As in the traditional theory [24] viscous decoupling is assumed to hold, i.e. $R_{31} = 0$ and $R_{13} = 0$. *[5.1.2.4]* Next, assuming that $R_1 \gg M_1$, $R_3 \gg M_3$, and $S_i \neq 0$ one finds *[page 6, §0]*

$$(37a) \quad \phi_1(\nabla P_1 - \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g}) = -R_1\mathbf{v}_1 = -R_1\frac{\phi_{\mathbb{W}}}{\phi_1}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}}$$

$$(37b) \quad \nabla P_3 = -\nabla\Pi_{c\mathbb{W}} + \gamma P_2^*\nabla S_2^{\gamma-1} + \varrho_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{g}$$

$$(37c) \quad \phi_3(\nabla P_3 - \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g}) = -R_3\mathbf{v}_3 = -R_3\frac{\phi_{\mathbb{O}}}{\phi_3}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}}$$

$$(37d) \quad \nabla P_1 = -\nabla\Pi_{c\mathbb{O}} + \delta P_4^*\nabla S_4^{\delta-1} + \varrho_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{g}$$

where barycentric velocities $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}}$ defined through

$$(38a) \quad S_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}} = S_1\mathbf{v}_1 + S_2\mathbf{v}_2$$

$$(38b) \quad S_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}} = S_3\mathbf{v}_3 + S_4\mathbf{v}_4$$

have been introduced. *[6.0.0.1]* Subtracting eq. (37a) from eq. (37c), as well as eq. (37d) from eq. (37b), and equating the result gives

$$2(\varrho_{\mathbb{O}} - \varrho_{\mathbb{W}})\mathbf{g} + \frac{R_1}{\phi_1^2}\phi_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}} - \frac{R_3}{\phi_3^2}\phi_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}} =$$

$$(39) \quad \nabla\left(\Pi_a S_1^{-\alpha} - \Pi_b S_3^{-\beta} + \gamma P_2^*S_2^{\gamma-1} - \delta P_4^*S_4^{\delta-1}\right)$$

where eq. (22) has also been employed. *[6.0.0.2]* This result can be compared to the traditional theory where one finds from eqs. (12) and (13)

$$(40) \quad (\varrho_{\mathbb{O}} - \varrho_{\mathbb{W}})\mathbf{g} + \frac{\mu_{\mathbb{W}}}{kk_{\mathbb{W}}^r}\phi_{\mathbb{W}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{W}} - \frac{\mu_{\mathbb{O}}}{kk_{\mathbb{O}}^r}\phi_{\mathbb{O}}\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{O}} = \nabla P_c$$

Again this seems to imply $P_c = P_c(S_{\mathbb{W}}, S_2, S_4)$ as already found above for hydrostatic equilibrium. *[6.0.0.3]* However, within the RDA additional constraints follow from mass balance (34).

*[6.0.1.1]* First, observe that adding (34a) to (34b) resp. (34c) to (34d) with the help of eq. (38a) yields the traditional mass balance eqs. (11). *[6.0.1.2]* Next, verify by insertion that eqs. (34b) and (34d) admit the solutions

$$(41a) \quad S_2(\mathbf{x}, t) = S_2^*(\mathbf{x}) + (S_{20}(\mathbf{x}) - S_2^*(\mathbf{x}))$$
$$\times \left(\frac{S_{\mathbb{W}}^*(\mathbf{x}) - S_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x}, t)}{S_{\mathbb{W}}^*(\mathbf{x}) - S_{\mathbb{W}0}(\mathbf{x})}\right)^{\eta_2}$$

$$(41b) \quad S_4(\mathbf{x}, t) = S_4^*(\mathbf{x}) + (S_{40}(\mathbf{x}) - S_4^*(\mathbf{x}))$$
$$\times \left(\frac{S_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x}, t) - S_{\mathbb{W}}^*(\mathbf{x})}{S_{\mathbb{W}0}(\mathbf{x}) - S_{\mathbb{W}}^*(\mathbf{x})}\right)^{\eta_4}$$

where the displacement process is assumed to start from the initial conditions

$$(42a) \quad S_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbf{x}, t_0) = S_{\mathbb{W}0}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$(42b) \quad S_2(\mathbf{x}, t_0) = S_{20}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$(42c) \quad S_4(\mathbf{x}, t_0) = S_{40}(\mathbf{x})$$

at some initial instant $t_0$. *[6.1.0.3]* The limiting saturations $S_{\mathbb{W}}^*, S_{\mathbb{O}}^*, S_2^*, S_4^*$ are given by eqs. (29). *[6.1.0.4]* They depend only on the sign of $\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}/\partial t$ if $\tau \gg \partial S_{\mathbb{W}}/\partial t$ can be assumed to hold. *[6.1.0.5]* One finds in this case

$$(43a) \quad S_{\mathbb{W}}^* = 1 - S_{\mathbb{O}\,im}$$

$$(43b) \quad S_{\mathbb{O}}^* = S_{\mathbb{O}\,im}$$

$$(43c) \quad S_2^* = 0$$

$$(43d) \quad S_4^* = S_{\mathbb{O}\,im}$$

for imbibition processes (i.e. $\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}/\partial t > 0$), resp.

$$(44a) \quad S_{\mathbb{W}}^* = S_{\mathbb{W}\,dr}$$

$$(44b) \quad S_{\mathbb{O}}^* = 1 - S_{\mathbb{W}\,dr}$$

$$(44c) \quad S_2^* = S_{\mathbb{W}\,dr}$$

$$(44d) \quad S_4^* = 0$$

for drainage processes (i.e. $\partial S_{\mathbb{W}}/\partial t < 0$).

*[6.1.1.1]* With these solutions in hand the capillary pressure can be identified up to a constant as

$$(45) \quad P_c(S_{\mathbb{W}}) = \frac{1}{2}\left[\Pi_a(S_{\mathbb{W}} - S_2)^{-\alpha}\right.$$
$$\left. -\Pi_b(1 - S_{\mathbb{W}} - S_4)^{-\beta} + \gamma P_2^*S_2^{\gamma-1} - \delta P_4^*S_4^{\delta-1}\right]$$

where $S_2 = S_2(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ and $S_4 = S_4(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ are given by eqs. (41). *[6.1.1.2]* This result holds in the RDA combined with the assumptions above. *[6.1.1.3]* Furthermore, equations (37a) and (37c) are recognized as generalized Darcy laws with relative permeabilities identified as

$$(46a) \quad k_{\mathbb{W}}^r(S_{\mathbb{W}}) = 2R_1^{-1}\frac{\mu_{\mathbb{W}}}{k}\phi^2(S_{\mathbb{W}} - S_2)^2$$

$$(46b) \quad k_{\mathbb{O}}^r(S_{\mathbb{W}}) = 2R_3^{-1}\frac{\mu_{\mathbb{O}}}{k}\phi^2(1 - S_{\mathbb{W}} - S_4)^2$$

FIGURE 1. Hysteresis loop and drainage scanning curves for capillary pressure $P_c$ as function of water saturation $S_{\mathbb{W}}$ fitted to experimental data obtained for a water wet medium grained sand of porosity $\phi = 0.34$. The primary drainage curve is the dash-dotted line. The main hysteresis loop is the solid line. The dashed lines are drainage scanning curves. All eight curves have the same parameters: $S_{\mathbb{W}\,\mathrm{dr}} = 0.15$, $S_{\mathbb{O}\,\mathrm{im}} = 0.19$, $\alpha = 0.52$, $\beta = 0.90$, $\gamma = 1.5$, $\delta = 3.5$ $\eta_2 = 4$, $\eta_4 = 3$, $\Pi_a = 1620$ Pa, $\Pi_b = 25$ Pa, and $P_2^* = 2500$ Pa $P_4^* = 400$ Pa. The five scanning curves start from the boundary imbibition curve at $S_{\mathbb{W}} = 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7$ .



FIGURE 2. Hysteresis loop for capillary pressure $P_c$ as function of water saturation $S_{\mathbb{W}}$ as in Fig. 1. The imbibition scanning curves start from the secondary drainage curve. Parameters and line styles are identical to those in Figure 1.

where $S_2 = S_2(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ and $S_4 = S_4(S_{\mathbb{W}})$ are again given by eqs. (41).

4.3. **Reproduction of experimental observations.** *[6. 1.2.1]* Figure 1 visualizes the results obtained by fitting eq. (45) to experiment. *[6.1.2.2]* The experimental results are depicted as triangles (primary drainage) and squares (imbibition). *[6.1.2.3]* The experiments were performed in a medium grained unconsolidated

water wet sand of porosity $\phi = 0.34$. *[6.1.2.4]* Water was used as wetting fluid while air resp. TCE were used as the nonwetting fluid. *[6.1.2.5]* The experiments were carried out over a period of several weeks at the Versuchseinrichtung zur Grundwasser- und Altlastensanierung (VEGAS) *[page 7, §0]* at the Universität Stuttgart. *[7.0.0.1]* They are described in more detail in Ref. [25]. The parameters for all the curves shown in all four figures are $S_{\mathbb{W}\,\mathrm{dr}} = 0.15$, $S_{\mathbb{O}\,\mathrm{im}} = 0.19$, $\alpha = 0.52$, $\beta = 0.90$, $\gamma = 1.5$, $\delta = 3.5$ $\eta_2 = 4$, $\eta_4 = 3$, $\Pi_a = 1620$ Pa, $\Pi_b = 25$ Pa, and $P_2^* = 2500$ Pa $P_4^* = 400$ Pa.

*[7.0.1.1]* If it is further assumed that the medium is isotropic and that the matrices $R_1, R_3$ have the form

(47a) $\quad R_1 = R_1^* \phi_1^{-\kappa_{\mathbb{W}}} \mathbf{1}$

(47b) $\quad R_3 = R_3^* \phi_3^{-\kappa_{\mathbb{O}}} \mathbf{1}$

then the relative permeability functions are obtained from eqs. (46). *[7.0.1.2]* The result for the special case $\kappa_{\mathbb{W}} = \kappa_{\mathbb{O}} = 0$ is shown in Figures 3 and 4. *[7.0.1.3]* The parameters $R_1^*, R_3^*$ are chosen such that $R_1^* = 2\phi^2 \mu_{\mathbb{W}}/k$

FIGURE 3. Hysteresis loop and drainage scanning curves for relative permeabilities $k_{\mathbb{W}}^r, k_{\mathbb{O}}^r$ as function of water saturation $S_{\mathbb{W}}$. Parameters and line styles are identical to those for capillary pressure in Figures 1 and 2. Here $\kappa_{\mathbb{W}} = \kappa_{\mathbb{O}} = 0$ and the parameters $R_1^*, R_3^*$ are chosen such that $R_1^* = 2\phi^2\mu_{\mathbb{W}}/k$ and $R_3^* = 2\phi^2\mu_{\mathbb{O}}/k$.



FIGURE 4. Same as Figure 3 with imbibition scanning curves starting from the secondary drainage curve. Parameters and line styles are identical to those in Figure 3.

and $R_3^* = 2\phi^2\mu_{\mathbb{O}}/k$, where $\mu_{\mathbb{W}}, \mu_{\mathbb{O}}$ are the fluid viscosities and $k$ is the absolute permeability of the medium. [7.0.1.4] All other parameters for the relative permeability functions shown in Figures 3 and 4 are identical to those of the capillary pressure curves in Figures 1 and 2.

[7.0.2.1] Note that Figures 1 through 4 show a total of 30 different scanning curves, 5 drainage and 5 imbibition scanning curves each for $P_c, k_{\mathbb{W}}^r$ and $k_{\mathbb{O}}^r$. [7.1.0.2] In addition a total of 9 different bounding curves are displayed, namely the primary drainage, secondary drainage and secondary imbibition curve for $P_c, k_{\mathbb{W}}^r$ and $k_{\mathbb{O}}^r$. [7.1.0.3] Three more bounding curves namely primary imbibition for $P_c, k_{\mathbb{W}}^r$ and $k_{\mathbb{O}}^r$ starting from $S_{\mathbb{W}} = 0$ are not shown because they are difficult to obtain experimentally for a water-wet sample. [7.1.0.4] Of course

the number of scanning curves can be increased indefinitely. [7.1.0.5] All of these curves have the same values of the constitutive parameters. [7.1.0.6] There is less than one parameter per curve. [7.1.0.7] The curves shown in the figures exhibit the full range of hysteretic phenomena known from experiment. [7.1.0.8] Nevertheless it should be kept in mind that these curves are obtained only under special approximations, and when these are not valid such curves do not exist.

## 5. CONCLUSION

[7.1.1.1] The present paper has shown that the experimental observations on hysteresis and process dependence of capillary pressure and relative permeabilities can be reproduced within a macroscopic phenomenological theory. [7.1.1.2] The approach is based on the distinction between percolating and nonpercolating fluid phases introduced in [14, 16, 15]. [7.1.1.3] Contrary to what was expected, the introduction of interfacial areas can be avoided at the expense of some rather drastic constitutive assumptions. [7.1.1.4] In spite of these assumptions the present theory is more general

than the traditional theory because the *[page 8, §0]* latter can be obtained as a special case. *[8.0.0.1]* In this special case capillary pressure and relative permeability functions can be identified, and are found to show similar hysteresis and process dependence as observed in experiment.

## References

[1] J. Bear. *Dynamics of Fluids in Porous Media*. Elsevier Publ. Co., New York, 1972.

[2] M. Blunt, M.J. King, and H. Scher. Simulation and theory of two-phase flow in porous media. *Phys. Rev. A*, 46:7680, 1992.

[3] M. Blunt and P. King. Macroscopic parameters from simulations of pore scale flow. *Phys. Rev. A*, 42:4780, 1990.

[4] H.J. Butt, K.H. Graf, and M. Kappl. *Physics and Chemistry of Interfaces*. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2003.

[5] R.E. Collins. *Flow of Fluids through Porous Materials*. Reinhold Publishing Co., New York, 1961.

[6] M.M. Dias and A.C. Payatakes. Network models for two-phase flow in porous media I: Immiscible microdisplacement of non-wetting fluids. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 164:305, 1986.

[7] M.I.J.van Dijke and K. Sorbie. Pore-scale network model for three-phase flow in mixed-wet porous media. *Phys.Rev.E*, 66:046302, 2002.

[8] F.A.L. Dullien. *Porous Media - Fluid Transport and Pore Structure*. Academic Press, San Diego, 1992.

[9] I. Fatt. The network model of porous media I. capillary pressure characteristics. *AIME Petroleum Transactions*, 207:144, 1956.

[10] M. Ferer, G.S. Bromhal, and D.H. Smith. Pore-level modeling of drainage: Crossover from invasion percolation fingering to compact flow. *Phys.Rev.E*, 67:051601, 2003.

[11] S.M. Hassanizadeh, M.A. Celia, and H.K. Dahle. Dynamic effect in the capillary pressure-saturation relationship and its impacts on unsaturated flow. *Vadose Zone Journal*, 1:38, 2002.

[12] R. Helmig. *Multiphase Flow and Transport Processes in the Subsurface*. Springer, Berlin, 1997.

[13] R. Hilfer. Transport and relaxation phenomena in porous media. *Advances in Chemical Physics*, XCII:299, 1996.

[14] R. Hilfer. Macroscopic equations of motion for two phase flow in porous media. *Physical Review E*, 58:2090, 1998.

[15] R. Hilfer and H. Besserer. Macroscopic two phase flow in porous media. *Physica B*, 279:125, 2000.

[16] R. Hilfer and H. Besserer. Old problems and new solutions for multiphase flow in porous media. In A. Dmitrievsky and M. Panfilov, editors, *Porous Media: Physics, Models, Simulation*, page 133, Singapore, 2000. World Scientific Publ. Co.

[17] R. Hilfer and R. Helmig. Dimensional analysis and upscaling of two-phase flow in porous media with piecewise constant heterogeneities. *Adv. Water Res.*, 27:1033, 2004.

[18] L.W. Lake. *Enhanced Oil Recovery*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1989.

[19] M. Leverett. Capillary behaviour in porous solids. *Trans. AIME*, 142:152, 1941.

[20] J.B. Maillet and P.V. Coveney. Two-dimensional hydrodynamic lattice-gas simulations of binary immiscible and ternary amphiphilic fluid flow through porous media. *Phys.Rev.E*, 62:2898, 2000.

[21] N.R. Morrow(ed.). *Interfacial Phenomena in Petroleum Recovery*, volume 36 of *Surfactant Science Series*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1991.

[22] M. Muskat. *The Flow of Homogeneous Fluids through Porous Media*. McGraw Hill, New York, 1937.

[23] M. Muskat and M. Meres. Flow of heterogeneous fluids through porous media. *Physics*, 7:346, 1936.

[24] A.E. Scheidegger. *The Physics of Flow Through Porous Media*. University of Toronto Press, Canada, 1957.

[25] H. Sheta. *Simulation von Mehrphasenvorgängen in porösen Medien unter Einbeziehung von Hysterese-Effekten*. PhD thesis, Institut für Wasserbau, Universität Stuttgart, 1999.

[26] W.O. Smith, P.D. Foote, and P.F. Busang. Capillary rise in sands of uniform spherical grains. *Physics*, 1:18, 1931.

[27] E. Spiteri and R. Juanes. Impact of relative permeability hysteresis on the numerical simulation of WAG injection. paper SPE89921 presented 2004 SPE Annual Technical Conference, Houston Texas, USA, 2004.

[28] R.D. Wyckoff and H. Botset. Flow of gas-liquid mixtures through unconsolidated sands. *Physics*, 7:325, 1936.

Institut für Computerphysik, Universität Stuttgart, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany, and, Institut für Physik, Universität Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany