

**9. Study On Co2 Soaking Time And “Huff And Puff” Injection Cycle Effect In Tight Permeability Reservoir**



**SCOG**  
SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION OIL AND GAS

**JOURNAL**

ISSN : 2089-3361  
e-ISSN : 2541-0520



VOLUME 45, NUMBER 1, APRIL 2022

ACCREDITED RISTEKDIKTI  
NO. 30/EKPT/2018

Vol 42, No1(2019)

## Table of Contents

### Articles

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| <b>IMBIBITION WATER-OIL RELATIVE PERMEABILITY: INTRODUCTION OF WETTABILITY STRENGTH FOR ENHANCING MODEL ROBUSTNESS</b><br><i>Bambang Widarsono</i>   | 1 - 8   |
| <b>STUDY ON CO2 SOAKING TIME AND HUFF AND PUFF INJECTION CYCLE EFFECT IN TIGHT PERMEABILITY RESERVOIR</b><br><i>Muslim Abdurrahman, Fiki H. Ferizal, Dadan D.S.M. Saputra, Riri P. Sari</i>  | 9 - 14  |
| <b>THE PREFERENTIAL WELD CORROSION OF X65 CARBON STEEL PIPELINE UNDER CO2 ENVIRONMENT</b><br><i>Nofrizal Nofrizal</i>  | 15 - 28 |
| <b>CATALYTIC PERFORMANCE OF ZSM-5 ZEOLITE IN HEAVY HYDROCARBON CATALYTIC CRACKING: A REVIEW</b><br><i>Ratu Ulfiati</i>   | 29 - 34 |
| <b>DEPOSITIONAL PROCESSES AND FACIES ARCHITECTURE OF BALIKPAPAN SANDSTONE FORMATION, APPLICATION OF 3D DIGITAL OUTCORP MODEL (DOM) TO IDENTIFY RESERVOIR GEOMETRY AND DISTRIBUTION IN DELTAIC SYSTEM</b><br><i>Rian Cahya Rohmana, Iqbal Fardiansyah, Leon Taufani, Dicky Harishidayat</i> | 35 - 42 |



HOME ABOUT LOGIN REGISTER SEARCH CURRENT ARCHIVES CONTACTS JOURNAL LEMIGAS

Home > About the Journal > **Editorial Team**

## Editorial Team

### Chief Editor

Prof. Dr. Bambang Widarsono, M.Sc., Petroleum Engineering, National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia

### Managing Editor

EfwiZen Chaniago, S.Sos. M.A.P, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia, Indonesia  
 Abdul Haris, S.Si., M.Si, National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia, Indonesia  
 Purwo Subagiyo, S.E, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia

### Associate Editor

Dr Junita Trivianty, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Dr Humbang Purba, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Dr Tri Muji Susantoro, National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia  
 Dr Cut Nanda, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Dr Rachmi Kartini, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Dr Christina Ani Setyaningsing, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia, Indonesia, Indonesia  
 Dr. Riesta Anggarani, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Dr. Ir. Usman Pasarai, National Research and Innovation Agency,, Indonesia  
 Himawanto, S.T., M.Hum., Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia

### International Editorial Boards

Prof. Dr. Bambang Widarsono, M.Sc., Petroleum Engineering, National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia  
 Prof. Dr. Istadi, M.T., University of Diponegoro, Indonesia  
 Prof. Dr. Maezar Rahman, Chemical Engineering, PPPTMGB "LEMIGAS", Indonesia, Indonesia  
 Prof. Dr. Ir. M. Kholil, Management of Environment, IPB/USAHID, Indonesia  
 Prof. Ir. Septoratro Siregar, Ph.D, Petroleum Engineering-Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia  
 Prof. M. Udiharto, Biologist, PPPTMGB "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Prof. Dr. R. P. Koesoemadinata, Geologist Engineering-Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia  
 Prof. Pudji Permadi, Ph.D, Reservoir Engineering-Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia  
 Prof. Ir. Renanto, M.S., Ph.D., Technology Institute of Surabaya, Indonesia  
 Dr. Mont., Drs. Anda Lucia, M.T., BBPMGB LEMIGAS, Indonesia  
 Dr. Ulrike Schacht, Geo Marine Chemist, University of Adelaide, Australia  
 Dr. Robert John Morley, Palynologist and Startigrapher, Palynova, United Kingdom  
 Dr. Ing. Ir. KRT. Nur Suhascaryo, B.Eng., M.Eng, Petroleum Engineering-University of National Development "Veteran" Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
 Dr. Hyundon Shin, Inha University, Korea, Republic of  
 Dr. Ing. Suhendra, UIN, Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
 Dr. Ir. Usman Pasarai, National Research and Innovation Agency,, Indonesia  
 Dr. Restu Juniah, University of Lampung, Indonesia  
 Dr. Ir. Dedy Kristanto, Petroleum Engineering-University of National Development "Veteran" Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
 Dr. Ir. Noor Cahyo D. Aryanto, M. T, Geologi Eksplorasi dan Petrologi Geokimia, Indonesia  
 Dr. Ir. Eko Budi Lelono, Palynologist, Agency for Geology, Indonesia  
 Dr. Mudjito Mudjito, BBPMGB LEMIGAS, Indonesia  
 Dr. Adiwir ., Separation Process Engineering, PPPTMGB "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Dr. Oberlin Sidjabat, Chemical Engineering and Catalyst, PPPTMGB "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Ph. D. Valentina Alvarez, Centro de Investigación en Ecosistemas de la Patagonia (CIEP), Chile  
 Ph. D. Ryozo Noguchi, University of Kyoto, Japan  
 Ir. Bagus Pudji Laksono, M.Sc., Lic.Eng., Ph.D, Physical-Chemical Engineering-Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia  
 Ir. Jonathan Setyoko Hadimuljono, National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia  
 John G Kaldi, M.Sc., Ph.D, University of Adelaide, Australia

### Assistant Editor

Ferry Imanuddin Sadikin, S.T., M.E., Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Nurchadi Setiawan, A.Md, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Andry Hidayat, S.Kom, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Yadi Pramesti, S.Kom, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Windy Permata Luvian, S.I.P, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia

### Secretariat

Wulandari Dianningtyas, S.E, M.A.B, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Dicky Christian Fransiscus, S.Sos, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia

### Lay Outer

Andry Hidayat, S.Kom, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Achmad Zulfikar, S.Kom, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia  
 Syamsuddin, A.Md, Research and Development Center for Oil and Gas Technology "LEMIGAS", Indonesia

#### Editorial Board

Peer Reviewer

Peer Review Process/Policy

Aim & Scope

Author Guidelines

Online Submission

Presence of Substance

Publication Ethics

#### USER

Username

Password

Remember me

#### TOOLS



#### TEMPLATE



#### JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

Search Scope

All

#### Browse

By Issue

By Author


By Title

Other Journals

#### Journal Help

Visitor Counter:





Copyright 2021 | Scientific Contributions Oil and Gas (SCOG). Powered By OJS

**LEMIGAS**



## STUDY ON CO<sub>2</sub> SOAKING TIME AND “HUFF AND PUFF” INJECTION CYCLE EFFECT IN TIGHT PERMEABILITY RESERVOIR

Muslim Abdurahman<sup>1)</sup>, Fiki H. Ferizal<sup>1)</sup>, Dadan D.S.M. Saputra<sup>2)</sup>, and Riri P. Sari<sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Petroleum Engineering Department Universitas Islam Riau  
Jl. Kaharuddin Nasution No. 113 KM 11, Pekanbaru, Riau 28284  
Telephone: 62-761-674676

E-mail: muslim@eng.uir.ac.id

“LEMIGAS” R & D Centre for Oil and Gas Technology

Jl. Ciledug Raya, Kav. 109, Cipulir, Kebayoran Lama, P.O. Box 1089/JKT, Jakarta Selatan 12230 INDONESIA  
Tromol Pos: 6022/KBYB-Jakarta 12120, Telephone: 62-21-7394422, Faxsimile: 62-21-7246150

E-mail: dadan.saputra@esdm.go.id

First Registered on Februari 18<sup>th</sup> 2019; Received after Correction on March, 11<sup>th</sup> 2019

Publication Approval on: April 30<sup>th</sup> 2019

### ABSTRAK

Industri migas berupaya untuk meningkatkan produksi minyak menggunakan beberapa metode. Salah satunya yaitu injeksi CO<sub>2</sub> merupakan teknologi lebih lanjut yang terbukti dapat meningkatkan produksi minyak di beberapa lapangan minyak di dunia. Parameter utama dalam injeksi CO<sub>2</sub> adalah pengurangan viskositas dan pengembangan minyak di mana nantinya akan meningkatkan produksi minyak. Injeksi CO<sub>2</sub> juga mempunyai tingkat kemungkinan yang tinggi untuk dapat diaplikasikan di lapangan-lapangan minyak Indonesia karena lapangan-lapangan tersebut memiliki sumber-sumber CO<sub>2</sub> yang cukup besar di sekitarnya. Lapangan R merupakan salah satu kandidat yang cocok untuk injeksi CO<sub>2</sub>. Lapangan ini memiliki tekanan dan perolehan minyak yang rendah akibat permeabilitas yang rendah (1-26.2 mD). Teknik injeksi CO<sub>2</sub> yang digunakan pada studi ini yaitu huff and puff yang terdiri dari fasa injeksi, penutupan sumur, dan produksi. Simulasi dilakukan menggunakan simulator komposisional. Terdapat dua parameter yang akan dianalisis, yaitu soaking time, dan siklus injeksi. Tujuan dari studi ini yaitu untuk mengetahui performa dari CO<sub>2</sub> huff and puff untuk meningkatkan perolehan minyak pada reservoir dengan permeabilitas yang rendah. Hasil dari scenario soaking time menunjukkan kondisi optimal terjadi dalam 21 hari. Untuk scenario siklus injeksi, hasil optimal tercapai pada 2 siklus injeksi. Nilai faktor perolehan (RF) untuk masing-masing kondisi optimal mencapai 22.96% dari nilai baseline tanpa gas injeksi (RF 5.82%).

**Kata Kunci:** huff and puff, waktu soaking, siklus injeksi, injeksi CO<sub>2</sub>, tight permeability reservoir

### ABSTRACT

Oil and gas industry is struggling to improve oil production using several methods. CO<sub>2</sub> injection is one of the advance proven technology to enhance oil production in numerous oil field in the world. Key parameters during CO<sub>2</sub> injection are viscosity reduction and oil swelling which can improve oil production. CO<sub>2</sub> injection also has high possibility to be applied in Indonesia's oil fields due to abundant CO<sub>2</sub> sources surrounding oil fields. R field is one of reservoir candidates that appropriate for CO<sub>2</sub> injection. It has a low pressure and low oil recovery due to low permeability (1-26.2 mD). The CO<sub>2</sub> injection technique used in this study was huff and puff that consist of injection, shut in, and production phases. The simulation was conducted using compositional simulator. There were two parameters chosen to be analyzed, which were soaking time and injection cycle. The objective of this study is to know the CO<sub>2</sub> huff and puff performance for improving oil recovery on low permeability reservoir. The result of the soaking time cases yields optimum condition in 21 days. For the case of injection cycle, the result for optimum condition is in 2



injection cycles. The recovery factor (RF) for both optimum condition reaches 22.96% from the baseline without gas injection (RF 5.82%).

**Keywords:** huff and puff, soaking time, injection cycle, CO<sub>2</sub> injection, tight permeability reservoir

---

**How to cite this article:**

Abdurahman, M., et al., 1, 2019, STUDY ON CO<sub>2</sub> SOAKING TIME AND “HUFF AND PUFF” INJECTION CYCLE EFFECT IN TIGHT PERMEABILITY RESERVOIR, *Scientific contributions Oil and Gas*, 42 (1) pp, 1 - 8 DOI: 10.29017/SCOG. 41.1.1-15.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Oil and gas industry are trying to find the advance and right technology to improve oil recovery with using either conventional or unconventional cases recently. CO<sub>2</sub> injection is one of Enhance Oil Recovery (EOR) technology that quite popular in the world. CO<sub>2</sub> injection could capable of increasing the well productivity through viscosity reduction and oil swelling. Moreover, CO<sub>2</sub> injection is also suitable to be flooded into light oil, medium, oil, and heavy oil (Singh, Singhal, & Sim 2006).

CO<sub>2</sub> injection has high possibility to be applied in Indonesia's oil field. There are a lot of fields according to screening criteria that matches to the condition and rich CO<sub>2</sub> sources in Indonesia. For example, natural hydrocarbon gas reservoir in Natuna which contain 71% mole CO<sub>2</sub>, and also natural gas processing plant in West Java with CO<sub>2</sub> percentage around 45%-75%. CO<sub>2</sub> source in Indonesia also can be collected from power plant and oil and gas industry that produced gas with less than 25% mole CO<sub>2</sub> (Muslim, et al., 2013).

CO<sub>2</sub> ‘huff n puff’ is one of injection method that involves injecting miscible gas into a well and then after some soaking time, producing back from the same well (Hoffman, 2018; Hoffman & Rutledge, 2019). This technique has been conducted successfully in some oil fields, such as Forest Reserve, in Trinidad and Tobago, which is the first field that applied with using CO<sub>2</sub> huff n puff (Singh, et al., 2006). In US, there are Big Sinking, U.S light oil with immiscible condition and South Louisiana, U.S light oil (Monger & Coma, 1988; Yu, et al., 2014) soak period, thicker interval, and lower prior water cut. Introduction This paper is a laboratory and field investigation of the CO<sub>2</sub> huff ‘n’ puff process for enhanced recovery of light crude oil. The results of continuous and cyclic CO<sub>2</sub> displacements with a 32 degrees API [0.87-g/cm<sup>3</sup>] stock-tank oil in watered-

out Berea cores are presented. Fourteen single-well cyclic CO<sub>2</sub> field tests in south presented. Fourteen single-well cyclic CO<sub>2</sub> field tests in south Louisiana sands are examined. Laboratory results demonstrate that the CO<sub>2</sub> huff ‘n’ puff process recovers waterflood residual oil. Incremental oil recovery process recovers waterflood residual oil. Incremental oil recovery increased with the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> injected and was not benefited by operating at the minimum miscibility pressure (MMP). Up to 9 % incremental RF could be gained when CO<sub>2</sub> huff n puff was used compared to production dependent only n hydraulic fracture stimulation (Pankaj, et al., 2018). Optimum injection pressure of CO<sub>2</sub> huff n puff processes can be set around the minimum miscible pressure (MMP) between oil and CO<sub>2</sub>, while the soaking time could be optimized for enhancing oil recovery (Song & Yang 2013; Yu et al. 2016). The number of huff n puff injection cycles can also be optimized to improve oil production (Li, et al., 2016; Meng, et al., 2015).

From this study, the optimum condition from soaking time and the number of injection cycles with using R field data will be determined. This field is classified having light oil reservoir, high oil saturation, and tight permeability. The objective of this study is to know the CO<sub>2</sub> huff and puff performance for improving oil recovery on low permeability reservoir.

## II. METHODOLOGY

This simulation study was conducted using compositional simulator CMG GEM. The simulation model was carried out by using simple and heterogeneous model (Figure 1). The size of the grid is 15x15x2 with wide around 10 acres. The reservoir characteristics were written in Table 1 with reservoir fluid classified into light oil. CO<sub>2</sub> huff and puff injection simulation scheme (Figure 2) were conducted beginning in the date of




Figure 1  
Conceptual simple simulation model.

Table 1  
Reservoir characteristics

| Parameter                  | Unit | Value   |
|----------------------------|------|---------|
| Initial Reservoir Pressure | Psi  | 1.267   |
| Reservoir Temperature      | °F   | 158,5   |
| Depth                      | Ft   | 3.045   |
| Thickness                  | Ft   | 10      |
| Porosity                   | %    | 19-26   |
| Permeability               | mD   | 1-26,2  |
| Oil Viscosity              | cP   | 0,4-0,6 |




Figure 2  
CO<sub>2</sub> Huff n Puff injection scheme.

18 March 2018 using immiscible condition. Initial recovery factor for this model is around 21,69%.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Soaking Time Effect Analysis

Soaking time is one of major consideration for CO<sub>2</sub> huff and puff injection. This parameter is focused to the well time interval during shut-in state until reach the optimal condition, so CO<sub>2</sub> may dissolve to the oil. This condition will have impacts to the other oil characteristics, such as reduction of viscosity and interfacial tension.

To determine the optimum soaking time, the simulation was done with three different times interval, that is: 7 days, 21 days, and 35 days. The consideration of the number of the days refers to previous research of other fields that have implemented CO<sub>2</sub> huff and puff injection. For instance, South Luisiana Field with soaking time 18-52 days (Monger & Coma, 1988) soak period, thicker interval, and lower prior water cut. IntroductionThis paper is a laboratory and field investigation of the CO<sub>2</sub> huff ‘n’ puff process for enhanced recovery of light crude oil. The results of continuous and cyclic CO<sub>2</sub> displacements with a 32 degrees API [0.87-g/

cm<sup>3</sup>] stock-tank oil in watered-out Berea cores are presented. Fourteen single-well cyclic CO<sub>2</sub> field tests in south presented. Fourteen single-well cyclic CO<sub>2</sub> field tests in south Louisiana sands are examined. Laboratory results demonstrate that the CO<sub>2</sub> huff ‘n’ puff process recovers waterflood residual oil. Incremental oil recovery process recovers waterflood residual oil. Incremental oil recovery increased with the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> injected and was not benefited by operating at the minimum miscibility pressure (MMP, Texas Field with soaking time 10-17 days (Yu, et al., 2014), dan G field with soaking time 7-38 days. In each of soaking time cases, the other variables are quite the same, which is injection period, production period, and injection rate is at 11.8 MSCF/day.

Figure 3 shows that different soaking times are not linear after reaching optimum condition. It means additional days for soaking time are not always increasing oil recovery. In general, different soaking time will affect recovery factor, even not significantly. However, soaking time determination must be conducted to reach the optimum condition. Soaking time which is too early will cause the recovery factor not in optimum state.




Figure 3  
The comparison of recovery factor to soaking time cases.



It is caused by the time needed by CO<sub>2</sub> to dissolve in oil become less, as a result, CO<sub>2</sub> performances to change oil characteristics was decreased. Soaking time that is too long will not lead to the optimum recovery factor, for production time losses reason.

The viscosity reduction is not significant parameter because reservoir fluid used in the model is light oil and the initial viscosity is already low. As shown in Fig 4 and 5, CO<sub>2</sub> injection will not really affect the reduction of viscosity and interfacial tension of the light oil. However, soaking time affects oil viscosity reduction which also improve recovery factor.

Based on the recovery factor and cumulative production (Table 2) from each case, the optimum soaking time needed is 21 days. This soaking time


are similar with the one used in other fields, which is 2-4 weeks from Singh et al. (2006). The optimum soaking time also depends on the reservoir characteristics and it caused by CO<sub>2</sub> can be dissolved more in this case, which resulting higher oil recovery.

**B. The Huff n Puff Injection Cycle Effect Analysis**

Huff n Puff injection cycle is the step from injection, soaking, and production that was done repeatedly. The number of cycles surely affects oil recovery. In these cases, the number of cycles used are different, that is 2 and 3 cycles. Injection rate and volume is constant in each of cases. Total time injection in each case is also similar, that is 150 days. Moreover, injection time are different in each

**Table 2**  
Incremental cumulative oil production for each soaking time cases

| Soaking Time (day) | Cumulative production (bbl) | Incremental of cumulative production (%) |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| N/A                | 23.762                      | -  |
| 7                  | 24.8                        | 4.37%                                    |
| 21                 | 25.146                      | 5.82%                                    |
| 35                 | 25.114                      | 5.69%                                    |



**Figure 4**  
Oil viscosity (soaking time 21 days).




Figure 5  
Interfacial tension (soaking time 21 days).




Figure 6  
Pressure vs time in each of cycle.




Figure 7  
Oil saturation (a) 2 cycle (b) 3 cycle.

of cycles. Injection time in 2 cycles is 75 days and 3 cycles is 50 days.

The different injection time is affecting pressure and time. Pressure with 2 injection cycles is higher than in 3 cycles (Figure 6). This pressure will affect oil recovery. If the pressure is higher, the oil recovery will become higher. The oil recovery is 22.96% and 21.8% in 2 and 3 cycles, respectively. This result was supported by drainage radius that as illustrated in Figure 7, which in 2 cycles is higher than in 3 cycles schemes. The optimum number of cycles to increase oil recovery is using 2 cycles. It is also similar with the study of Fulin & Yun (2010) in Jiangsu Field. However, the optimum of number of cycles may different, which caused by reservoir conditions.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In order to produce more oil from R field due to low permeability condition, the operational parameter such as optimum soaking time in 21 days and optimum cycle number with 2 cycles. Based on these simulation, oil recovery reach 5.82% or cumulative oil recovery of 25.146 bbl. Based on this study, the soaking time determination will have a great effect in the recovery factor. The huff n puff injection cycle determination also yields significant effect on the incremental oil production from huff n puff injection.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Department of Petroleum Engineering, Universitas Islam Riau and Computer Modelling Group (CMG) for this research opportunity. And also to PPPTMGB LEMIGAS as the research partner of Universitas Islam Riau, especially in oil and gas EOR researches.

#### REFERENCES

- Fulin, Y., & Yun, X. 2010. Jiangsu Oilfield is Carbon Dioxide Cyclic Stimulation Operations: Lessons Learned and Experiences Gained. SPE International Conference on CO<sub>2</sub> Capture, Storage, and Utilization.
- Hoffman, B.T. 2018. Huff-N-Puff Gas Injection Pilot Projects in the Eagle Ford. SPE Paper 189816 presented at SPE Canada Unconventional Resources Conference, Alberta, 13-14 March.
- Hoffman, B.T., Rutledge, J.M. 2019. Mechanisms for Huff-n-Puff Cyclic Gas Injection into Unconventional Reservoirs. SPE Paper 195223 presented at SPE Oklahoma City Oil and Gas Symposium, Oklahoma, 9-10 April.
- Li, L., Sheng, J.J., Sheng, J. 2016. Optimization of Huff-n-Puff Gas Injection to Enhance Oil Recovery in Shale Reservoirs. SPE Paper 180219 presented at SPE Low Perm Symposium, Denver, Colorado, 5-6 May.
- Meng, X., Sheng, J.J., Yu, Y. 2015. Evaluation of Enhanced Condensate Recovery Potential in Shale Plays by Huff-n-Puff Gas Injection. SPE Paper 177283 presented at SPE Eastern Regional Meeting, West Virginia, 13-15 October.

- Monger, T. G., & Coma, J. M.** 1988. A Laboratory and Field Evaluation of the CO<sub>2</sub> Huff-n-Puff Process for Light-Oil Recovery. SPE Reservoir Engineering, 3(4).
- Mohammed Singh. L., A.K. Singhal., and S. Sim.** 2006. Screening Criteria for Carbon Dioxide Huff 'n' Puff Operation. SPE Symposium on Improved Oil Recovery Held in Tulsa, Oklahoma, U.S.A 22-26 April.
- Muslim. A., Bae, W., A K.Permadi, Suranto, B. Gunadi, D.D., Saputra, Widyaningsih, R.** 2013. Opportunities and Challenges of CO<sub>2</sub> Flooding in Indonesia.
- Pankaj, P., Mukisa, H., Solovyeva, I., Xue, H.** 2018. Boosting Oil Recovery in Naturally Fractured Shale Using CO<sub>2</sub> Huff-n-Puff. SPE Paper 191823 presented at SPE Argentina Exploration and Production of Unconventional Resources Symposium, Neuquen, 14-16 August.
- Song, C., Yang, D.** 2013. Performance Evaluation of CO<sub>2</sub> Huff-n-Puff Processes in Tight Oil Formations. SPE Paper 167217 presented at SPE unconventional Resources Conference Canada, Alberta, 5-7 November.
- Yu, W., Lashgari, H.R., Sepehrnoori, K.** 2014. Simulation Study of CO<sub>2</sub> Huff-n-Puff Process in Bakken Tight Oil Reservoirs. SPE Paper 169575 presented at SPE Western North American and Rocky Mountain Joint Meeting, Denver, Colorado, 17-18 April.
- Yu, Y., Li, L., Sheng, J.J.** 2016. Further Discuss the Roles of Soaking Time and Pressure Depletion Rate in Gas Huff-n-Puff Process in Fractured Liquid-Rich Shale Reservoirs. SPE Paper 181471 presented at SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Dubai, 26-28 September.

