



HAL
open science

Effective medium modeling of diagenesis impact on the petroacoustic properties of carbonate rocks

Mathilde Adelinet, Jean-François Barthélémy, Elisabeth Bemer, Youri Hamon

► To cite this version:

Mathilde Adelinet, Jean-François Barthélémy, Elisabeth Bemer, Youri Hamon. Effective medium modeling of diagenesis impact on the petroacoustic properties of carbonate rocks. *Geophysics*, 2019, 84 (4), pp.WA43-WA57. 10.1190/geo2018-0559.1 . hal-02101736

HAL Id: hal-02101736

<https://hal.science/hal-02101736>

Submitted on 17 Sep 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Effective medium modeling of diagenesis impact on the petroacoustic properties of carbonate rocks

Mathilde Adelinet, Jean-François Barthélémy, Elisabeth Bemer, Youri Hamon

► **To cite this version:**

Mathilde Adelinet, Jean-François Barthélémy, Elisabeth Bemer, Youri Hamon. Effective medium modeling of diagenesis impact on the petroacoustic properties of carbonate rocks. *Geophysics, Society of Exploration Geophysicists*, 2019, 84 (4), pp.WA43-WA57. 10.1190/geo2018-0559.1 . hal-02101736

HAL Id: hal-02101736

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02101736>

Submitted on 17 Sep 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

EFFECTIVE MEDIUM MODELING OF DIAGENESIS IMPACT ON THE
PETROACOUSTIC PROPERTIES OF CARBONATE ROCKS

Mathilde Adelinet , Jean-François Barthélémy , Elisabeth Bemer,
Youri Hamon

ABSTRACT

Carbonate formations are heterogeneous and their velocity – porosity relationships are mainly controlled by microstructural parameters. As diagenesis is responsible for important changes in the microstructure of carbonate rocks, we propose here to extend the classic effective medium approach to model the impact of diagenesis on carbonate elastic properties through a step by step effective medium modeling. Two different carbonate formations are considered. The first key step is the characterization of the diagenesis which affected the studied carbonate series. An effective medium model integrating all the geological information accessible from thin section analysis is then built. The evolution of the microstructural parameters during diagenesis is thoroughly constrained based on an extensive experimental dataset, including XRD analysis, various porosimetry techniques and ultrasonic velocities measurements. Finally, direct calculations with the model provide elastic wave velocities representative of the different diagenetic stages. An extrapolation to permeability evolution is also introduced. This approach allows the identification of the acoustic signature of specific diagenetic events, such as dolomitization, dissolution or cementation, and the assessment of their impact on the flow properties of carbonate formations.

INTRODUCTION

Carbonate formations represent major targets for exploration and development of hydrocarbon reservoirs. Giant discoveries in offshore Brazil or Levant Basin for instance are driving new research avenues. In a more environmental context, carbonates are considered as key indicators of paleoclimates (Eiler et al., 2011). Indeed the various processes leading to their accumulation reflect the complex interplay between water chemistry, biotic productivity, sediment availability and geodynamic context. This is especially true for continental carbonates, thus adding hydrologic constrains (Kelts, 1990). Due to their various depositional modes, carbonates are characterized by wide ranges of primary fabrics and associated pore types. Afterwards, these fabrics are affected by different diagenetic processes which can either create or occlude porosity (Heydari, 2003; Lambert et al., 2006; Casteleyn et al., 2010, 2011; Makhloufi et al., 2013; Neveux et al., 2014; Carpentier et al., 2015; Clark and Vanorio, 2016; Nader et al., 2016). Besides, carbonate rocks show very specific mechanical compaction processes such as crystal plasticity and cataclasis (Vajdova et al, 2004; Baud et al., 2009; Nicolas et al., 2016), which further complicates the resulting microstructures.

Porosity, fabrics and pore types being the main control factors of elastic velocity in carbonate rocks (Eberli et al., 2003; Baechle et al., 2008; Verwer et al., 2008), it seems natural to seek to link elastic properties and diagenesis. However, only a few studies tackle the key issue of relating sedimentological and diagenetic features to physical properties measured at the sample scale and extrapolating the obtained results at the formation scale to derive global evolution laws (Brigaud, 2010; Regnet et al., 2015a, 2015b; Matonti et al., 2015, 2016). Numerous acoustic

Geophysics

3

1
2
3 experimental data have been acquired on carbonate rocks showing a wide range of variation and
4
5 indicating no clear velocity – porosity trends (Adam et al., 2006; Rasolofosaon and Zinszner,
6
7 2003; Rasolofosaon et al., 2008; Bemmerer et al., 2017). That is why modeling approaches have
8
9 been developed to explain the different elastic behavior observed on carbonates (Dvorkin et al.,
10
11 1995; Adam et al., 2006; Dou et al., 2011; Ba et al., 2013; Fournier et al., 2018; Regnet et al.,
12
13 2018). One of the most famous is the model developed by Xu and Payne (2009) which is an
14
15 extension of the model of Xu and White (1996) proposed for clastic rocks. In this model, the
16
17 authors assume that interparticle pores represent the most common pore type in carbonate rocks
18
19 and therefore provide a reference porosity – velocity trend. Reference pores are modeled by
20
21 ellipsoids with an aspect ratio equal to 0.15. Mixed pore types are then considered by added
22
23 either stiff pores (ellipsoids with an aspect ratio of 0.8) or cracks (ellipsoids with an aspect ratio
24
25 of 0.02) to the reference pores. The aspect ratio of 0.15 representing the reference pores appears
26
27 to be flatter than what is usually observed on thin sections for interparticle pores (Lonoy, 2006).
28
29 Using this model or other approaches only based on pore aspect ratios (e.g. Fournier et al.,
30
31 2018), lower experimental velocity data can only be explained through the presence of cracks
32
33 within the studied rocks. Yet, such features are scarcely observed on thin sections for carbonates
34
35 contrary to other rocks, for instance volcanic ones, where cracks lead to a specific mechanical
36
37 behavior (Adelinet et al., 2010; 2013). Moreover, for some carbonate rocks, velocities remain
38
39 low even if the confining pressure is increased enough to close the majority of cracks and micro-
40
41 defects.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 We thus propose a different approach to model the specific elastic behavior shown by
51
52 carbonate rocks where we introduce an interface stiffness around the main solid grains, which
53
54 can be dolomite or calcite in our case. By decoupling the elastic properties of the grain and its
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

4

1
2
3 interface, we add an additional compliance at the macroscale intended to represent the
4
5 mechanical response of grain contacts (Rasolofosaon and Zinszner, 2003). This is in agreement
6
7 with observed sedimentological features (Brigaud et al., 2010; Regnet et al., 2015a). We then use
8
9 the effective medium modeling as a tool to provide elastic velocities at different diagenesis
10
11 stages. This study is based on experimental results derived from a specific characterization
12
13 workflow designed to provide a comprehensive dataset including both input and constraining
14
15 data for effective medium modeling (Bemer et al., 2018).
16
17
18
19

METHODS

Experimental approach

20
21
22
23
24
25
26 The followed experimental workflow includes a non-destructive testing sequence
27
28 performed on the main sample and a series of microstructure analyses performed on subsamples.
29
30 The successive non-destructive characterization steps are: petroacoustic testing, porosity
31
32 measurement, NMR analysis on the brine-saturated sample and brine permeability measurement.
33
34 The main sample is then cut into several subsamples to obtain a vertical thin section, powder for
35
36 XRD analysis and small parts for mercury injection and possibly microscanner imaging. This last
37
38 analysis being costly, it is not performed on the whole sample set.
39
40
41
42

43
44 The key steps of the workflow are the petroacoustic testing performed on the main
45
46 samples and the petrographic characterization performed on the vertical thin sections. The other
47
48 measurements are more standard and their contribution arises from their consistent combination.
49

*Petrographic characterization*50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

5

1
2
3 One thin section per sample (cut along the axis of the oriented samples) has been
4 analyzed for faciologic and diagenetic purposes (texture, fabric, grain types, pore types,
5 mineralogy, cementation or dissolution features...). All thin sections are impregnated with blue
6 epoxy to identify the pore space) and stained with alizarin red-S to differentiate carbonate
7 minerals: (calcite is stained, while dolomite remains unstained; Dickson, 1966) and potassium
8 ferricyanid for distribution of ferrous iron.
9

10
11
12 Pre-microscopic observations are carried out under reflected and transmitted light with a
13 binocular microscope (Nikon SMZ 800) to have a large scale view of the samples and
14 characterize their general texture and porosity distribution. Petrographic observations are then
15 performed with a Nikon Eclipse LV100 POL microscope.
16

17
18
19 The thin section analysis provides qualitative structural information on the organization
20 of the different microstructural components (matrix, cement, pores). The sedimentary texture are
21 described using the classification of Dunham (1962), whereas the dolomite fabrics are described
22 using the classification of Sibley and Gregg (1987). The porosity is described following the
23 classification of Choquette and Pray (1970) and Lonoy (2006).
24

25
26
27 Image analysis on scanned thin sections has moreover been performed to provide a
28 surfacic estimation of the porosity and the mineral content by extracting the different colors
29 through threshold methods. The image analysis is performed with JMicroVision, which is a
30 freeware software designed to describe, measure, quantify and classify components of all kinds
31 of images and especially developed to analyze high definition images of rock thin sections
32 (<http://www.jmicrovision.com/index.htm>).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Geophysics

6

2
3 *Petroacoustic testing*

4
5
6
7 The petroacoustic cell has been designed to perform velocity measurements under an
8 isotropic confining pressure (up to 70 MPa). The sample is set in an impermeable Viton® jacket
9 to prevent any communication between the pore fluid and the confining fluid. The tests can thus
10 be performed at various differential pressures (*i.e.* difference between the confining pressure and
11 the pore pressure), and with various saturating fluids. All the tests have been carried out at a
12 differential pressure representative of in situ conditions.
13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 The upper and lower heads of the cell include a double P and S transducer (half-moon
22 ceramic, central frequency of 500 kHz). The first specificity of our approach is to analyze the
23 ultrasonic signals using the phase spectral ratio method, which gives the phase velocity
24 (Rasolofosaon and Zinszner, 2003). This method consists in applying a Fourier transform to the
25 recorded signal and to compare it, in the frequency domain, with a reference signal recorded in a
26 homogeneous medium of perfectly known velocity (in this case an aluminum sample). Carbonate
27 heterogeneity induces scattering effects usually referred to as "path dispersion" (Cadoret *et al.*,
28 1995). Contrary to the first break picking which leads to overestimated acoustic velocities, the
29 computation of the phase velocity allows a minimization of the heterogeneity effect
30 (Rasolofosaon *et al.*, 2008). The error on phase velocity measurements can be considered as less
31 than 2%, with a corresponding error on V_P/V_S ratio less than 4% (Bemer *et al.*, 2018).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The second specificity is to follow the fluid substitution method developed by
48 Rasolofosaon and Zinszner (2003). This approach consists in subsequently measuring the
49 acoustic velocities for various saturating liquids of different bulk modulus, the current saturating
50 fluid being replaced with a miscible one to ensure successive fully saturated states. The
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

7

1
2
3 substitution sequence is the following: brine (25 g/l NaCl), ethylene glycol, methanol, ethanol,
4
5 heptane, ethanol, brine (25 g/l NaCl). The key contribution of fluid substitution tests is to allow a
6
7 direct checking of the validity of Biot-Gassmann's equation without referring to less-controlled
8
9 dry measurements and without any assumption on the solid matrix bulk modulus (Bemer et al.,
10
11 2018). The obtained results moreover permit the direct identification of any weakening or
12
13 dispersion effects.
14
15

Combined microstructure characterization

16
17
18
19
20
21
22 The construction of a relevant microstructure model requires consistent information on
23
24 the mineral content and the porous phase, especially the proportion of microporosity and
25
26 macroporosity. The location of the microporosity has also to be specified. The experimental
27
28 workflow systematically includes X-Ray Diffraction (XRD) analysis to identify the mineral
29
30 phases and determine their volume fractions, and two different technics of pore-size
31
32 characterization: Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) and Mercury Injection Capillary Pressure
33
34 (MICP). These methods are detailed in our companion paper (Bemer et al., 2018). We focus here
35
36 on the key issues underlying their interpretation.
37
38
39
40

41
42 NMR and MICP explore different physical parameters and sample sizes: the NMR T_2
43
44 relaxation time is related to the pore volume over surface ratio and the T_2 distribution is obtained
45
46 for the whole sample, while MICP gives information on the pore throat size distribution for a
47
48 small part of the sample. The NMR analysis can be perturbed by pore coupling effects induced
49
50 by the mixing of molecules from nearby compartments through diffusion process. When no pore
51
52 coupling is observed, a comparative study between NMR and MICP data obtained on carefully
53
54 selected carbonate samples of various origins has shown that a cut-off of 200 ms in the NMR T_2
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

8

1
2
3 distribution could be used to separate the microporosity from the macroporosity, in accordance
4
5 with a pore throat diameter cut-off of 2 μm for MICP distributions (Vincent et al., 2011).
6
7

8
9 Microscanner imaging has been performed to provide additional information on the
10
11 repartition of micropores within the samples. Subsamples of 8-mm diameter are imaged for two
12
13 saturation states: dry and saturated by a 40 g/l K1-brine. Image subtraction can then be carried
14
15 out to identify the macropores and the microporous areas and derive the macroporosity and
16
17 microporosity volume fractions. The threshold between macroporosity and microporosity is then
18
19 associated to the image resolution which is equal to 8 μm for the imaged 8-mm subsamples. The
20
21 information provided by microscanner imaging is the more physically consistent for effective
22
23 medium modeling. It is however not available for all the samples and obtained on a smaller
24
25 volume than the NMR data.
26
27
28

29
30 The information derived from the NMR, MICP and microscanner analyses are finally
31
32 integrated to derive consistent fractions of microporosity and macroporosity for effective
33
34 medium modeling.
35
36
37

Effective medium modeling*Theory*

38
39
40
41
42
43
44 For sedimentary rocks such as sandstones, it is usually easy to derive a relationship
45
46 between elastic properties and microstructure description. However, due to their complex
47
48 microstructures, carbonate rocks do not appear to follow any simple or direct specific
49
50 relationship. The challenging issue is then to derive consistent elastic properties for carbonate
51
52 rocks from microstructure information. The effective medium theory offers a neat way to achieve
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

9

1
2
3 this objective. Indeed, it relies on physical models that describe within a Representative
4
5 Elementary Volume (REV) the macroscopic properties of a medium based on microstructural
6
7 characteristics. Such a theory can be used through a direct way, *i.e.* the elastic properties of the
8
9 rock are calculated from an exhaustive description of the microstructure, or through an inverse
10
11 approach, *i.e.* some microstructure features are derived from macroscopic properties such as
12
13 velocities. The effective medium modeling used in this study is a homogenization approach
14
15 relying on Eshelby's inclusion theory (Eshelby, 1957). The conceptual framework of the theory
16
17 consists in considering an ellipsoidal inclusion embedded within an infinite medium and the
18
19 disruption of the strain field in the medium due to this inclusion. As different inclusions are
20
21 present within a rock, for instance grains, pores or cracks, we have to use a homogenization
22
23 scheme to derive the macroscopic elastic properties at the REV scale. Different schemes can be
24
25 found in the literature. As carbonate rocks have complex microstructures and relatively high
26
27 porosities, we choose to use the self-consistent approach. In this scheme, an inclusion is
28
29 embedded within a medium which has the elastic properties of the effective medium. There are
30
31 no limits in porosity and it is well-adapted for unorganized mediums such as carbonate rocks.
32
33 Table 3 reports the elastic moduli allocated to the pure mineral phases present in the studied
34
35 samples.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 As elastic velocities measured on carbonate samples are often lower than what would be
45
46 expected from simple modeling (Eberli et al., 2003; Regnet et al., 2018), several authors have
47
48 introduce some cracks into the theoretical microstructure in order to better reproduce the
49
50 measured values (Xu and Payne, 2009; Zhao et al., 2013; Fournier et al., 2018). However, cracks
51
52 are rarely observed in geological thin sections. That is why we choose another approach to model
53
54 the specific behavior of carbonates. We introduce a compliant interface around the main
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Geophysics

10

2
3 carbonate grains intended to represent the mechanical response of grain contacts (Rasolofosaon
4 and Zinszner, 2003). In this approach, the grains have the mechanical properties of the
5
6 considered mineralogical phase (calcite or dolomite in our case) but the grain interface may have
7
8 different properties allowing a softer macroscopic behavior, and finally lower velocities than the
9
10 ones modeled without this compliant interface.
11
12
13

14
15
16 From a theoretical point of view, carbonate grains are modeled as rigid inclusions with a
17
18 smooth interface (Barthélémy, 2005). These inclusions differ from cohesive inclusions through
19
20 some mechanical discrepancies. First, the tangential component of the displacement field ξ at the
21
22 interface may be discontinuous but not the normal one, which prevents debonding or
23
24 interpenetration of grains. Second, at the interface between the homogenized medium and the
25
26 inclusion, the stress vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ is purely normal:
27
28
29

$$30 \quad \llbracket \xi \rrbracket \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$31 \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma_{nn} \mathbf{n} \quad (2)$$

32
33 where \mathbf{n} is the unit vector normal to the interface and σ_{nn} is the normal component of the stress
34
35 vector on the interface.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Contrary to pores, the strain field is null within the solid inclusions. However, if the
44
45 inclusion is surrounded by a smooth interface, the displacement discontinuities contribute to the
46
47 average of the strain field. The only constraint on the stress field is to ensure the continuity of the
48
49 stress vector at the interface between the homogenized medium and the inclusion. Finally, we
50
51 obtain a linear relationship between the stress vector at the interface and the displacement
52
53 discontinuity:
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \boldsymbol{\kappa} \cdot [\boldsymbol{\xi}] \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\kappa} = \kappa^n \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n} + \kappa^t (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n}) \quad (3)$$

where κ^n and κ^t are the normal and tangential stiffness of the interface.

The normal and tangential stiffness of the interface cannot be determined experimentally and have to be calculated through the inversion of the measured ultrasonic velocities. As for any inverse problems, the objective is to minimize an objective function J which is written as:

$$J(\kappa^n, \kappa^t) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 - \frac{[V_P^{\text{model}}(\kappa^n, \kappa^t)]^2}{[V_P^{\text{exp}}]^2} \right\}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 - \frac{[V_S^{\text{model}}(\kappa^n, \kappa^t)]^2}{[V_S^{\text{exp}}]^2} \right\}^2 \quad (4)$$

where the subscripts ^{exp} and ^{model} stand respectively for experimental data and effective medium modeling results. The minimization of this objective function will determine the unknown microstructure parameters κ^n and κ^t yielding the modeled velocities closest to the experimental ones.

Modeling workflow

A modeling workflow has been defined to calculate the elastic properties evolution according to diagenesis based on effective medium models and the extensive experimental dataset available on the studied carbonate samples. Figure 1 summarizes the different steps of this workflow. First, image analysis on thin sections, XRD analysis and pore size information derived from MICP, NMR and microscanner images (when available) are used to describe the layout of the rock microstructure: types and volume fractions of grains, identification of the solid phase with an interface, volume of cement, types of porosity, volume fractions of macroporosity and microporosity, location of microporosity... Based on the defined microstructure model, we use the measured ultrasonic velocities to invert the mechanical properties of the introduced interface.

Geophysics

12

1
2
3 As diagenetic events in carbonates are associated with aqueous fluid flows, the saturating fluid
4 used in the effective medium modeling is brine whose elastic parameters are given in Table 5.
5
6 Accordingly, the ultrasonic velocities considered here correspond to the brine-saturated
7
8 measurements. The range of porosity covered by the samples from each family is sufficiently
9
10 large to ensure a reasonable calibration of the interface parameters. At the end of this first step,
11
12 the derived microstructural model is representative of samples having experienced all the
13
14 diagenetic events.
15
16
17
18
19

20 The accurate diagenetic study performed on the thin sections is then used to individualize
21
22 the different diagenetic events and translate them into a step-by-step evolution of the effective
23
24 medium model. Finally, elastic properties are computed through the entire theoretical diagenetic
25
26 path. To do so, we consider that the interface stiffness parameters determined through inverse
27
28 analysis are representative of one specific mineral object (calcite or dolomite grains) and do not
29
30 evolve during diagenesis, which is a very strong hypothesis.
31
32
33
34

35 The main unknown remains the time of the diagenetic events. We thus use an arbitrary
36
37 temporal scale to represent the different diagenetic steps. We assume that all the samples are
38
39 representative of the final stage of diagenesis and have thus experienced all the previous
40
41 diagenetic steps identified in the paragenesis. They may however have been more or less
42
43 impacted by the last diagenetic process. We thus use their different macroporosity and
44
45 microporosity values to calibrate the evolution of the final diagenetic step. The evolutions during
46
47 the previous diagenetic steps are then defined based on the constraints imposed by the final
48
49 diagenetic step and additional assumptions on the initial stage based on our general knowledge
50
51 on carbonate systems.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PETROGRAPHIC CHARACTERIZATION: DEFINITION OF PARAGENESIS

Family 1

The five investigated samples roughly exhibit the same kind of texture, which may be described as a thrombolytic one (Riding, 1991). The latter is composed of large scale coalescent "mesoclots" (up to 4 mm long and 2 mm wide) forming a bushy, dendritic frame, loosely packed. These mesoclots have a sweeping feather-like extinction and a calcitic mineralogy. Samples F1-12, F1-15, F1-17 and F1-21 are very similar and show the development of a dolomite cement (Figure 2A). This cement is however poorly represented in sample F1-13 (Figure 2B). Important cement-reduced growth framework porosity (as defined in Choquette and Pray, 1970) is observed and image analysis estimations range from 8% (sample F1-15) to 18% (sample F1-17). These observations could point to a direct covariance between dolomite cementation and porosity. The mineral contents and porosity estimated through image analysis are reported in Table 1.

Several diagenetic phases can be identified and are presented in Figure 3 according to their relative timing established through crosscutting relationships observed during petrographic analyses and described below. Note that the proposed paragenesis should be considered with caution as it is only based on the observation of a few samples.

Millimetric silica orbicules with an irregular morphology are first observed in some mesoclots and even sometimes around mesoclots. They are composed of amorphous quartz (Silica 1), formed of anhedral crystals with wavy borders. The size of the quartz crystals is variable and range from 200 to 500 μm .

Geophysics

14

1
2
3 A cement phase consisted in a dog tooth, non ferroan calcite cement (Figure 2C, white
4 arrow) is then observed. It occurs as a first generation of voids filling (lining the mesoclots) and
5
6 clearly predates the dolomite cement (Figure 2C, black arrow). Crystal sizes range from 30 to
7
8
9
10 60 μm .

11
12
13 A few stylolites are observed in sample F1-21, but with no clear cross-cutting
14
15 relationships between these structures and the other diagenetic phases. The dolomite cement may
16
17 however have postdated the stylolitization, as the crystals are not affected by stylolites.
18
19 Additional observations would be needed to precise this relative timing and the origin of the
20
21 stylolitization.
22
23
24

25
26 Dolomitization occurs in varying proportions for all the studied samples as a dolomite
27
28 cement in the porosity. It exhibits a planar-e texture (Sibley and Gregg, 1987; mainly euhedral
29
30 crystals) with crystal sizes ranging from 100 to 250 μm (Figure 2C and Figure 2D, black arrow).
31
32 These crystals show a concentric zoning with a cloudy (sometimes brown) core and a limpid,
33
34 clear rim (10 to 50 μm).
35
36
37

38
39 This last rim shows a very irregular periphery and has thus clearly been corroded,
40
41 possibly pointing to a late alteration (dissolution) of the crystals. This dissolution phase has also
42
43 affected the mesoclots and may have created a vuggy micro-porosity (selective dissolution;
44
45 Figure 2E and Figure 2F, black arrow).
46
47
48

49 A phase of quartz cement (Silica 2) is observed in all the samples and particularly in
50
51 samples F1-12 and F1-21. This cement is composed of anhedral to subeuhedral limpid crystals
52
53 ranging from 50 to 400 μm and showing a drusy to granular development (Figure 2G, black
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Geophysics

2
3 arrow). It is developed in the porosity and clearly engulfs the dolomite cement, therefore post-
4
5 dating it.
6

7
8
9 In sample F1-12, scarce gypsum cement is observed. It forms cloudy inclusion-rich
10
11 crystals, displaying a tabular anhedral habitus (Figure 2H, black arrow). It develops in the
12
13 growth framework porosity, and engulfs dolomite crystals, thus postdating them (Figure 2H,
14
15 white arrow). The relative timing with the Silica 2 cement cannot be determined as no
16
17 crosscutting relationships are observed.
18

19 20 21 **Family 2**

22
23
24
25 The six investigated samples are dolomitized bioclastic wackestone to packstone (Figure
26
27 4). When preserved, bioclasts correspond to debris of echinoderms, lamellibranch and rare
28
29 benthic foraminifera. The matrix is pervasively but selectively dolomitized, as well as some
30
31 bioclasts or intraclasts. Porosity estimations (2D image analysis) range from 0 to 5%, and the
32
33 pore space is mainly made of moldic macropores (associated to bioclast dissolution) and
34
35 intercrystalline micropores (within the dolomitized matrix). The mineral contents and porosity
36
37 estimated through image analysis are reported in Table 1.
38
39

40
41
42 Several diagenetic phases can be identified and are presented in Figure 5 according to
43
44 their relative timing established through crosscutting relationships observed during petrographic
45
46 analyses and described below. As for Family 1, the proposed paragenesis should be considered
47
48 with caution as it is only based on the observation of a few samples.
49

50
51
52 A syntaxial cement mainly distributed as overgrowths (50 μm to up to 1 mm) around
53
54 crinoid fragments (Figure 4A and Figure 4B, white arrow) is observed in all the samples. It is
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

16

1
2
3 composed of inclusion-rich crystals of slightly ferroan calcite, frequently showing cleavage
4
5 twins.
6
7

8
9 A fabric-preserving replacement (inversion) of aragonitic allochems (mainly
10 lamellibranchs) by a non-ferroan inclusion-rich calcite is observed. The neomorphic calcites are
11 identified by the presence of solid organic and/or inorganic inclusions that concentrated along
12 the original shell growth lines and are still visible in the replaced allochem (Figure 4A and
13 Figure 4C, black arrow). The replacement fabric is characterized by a mosaic of coarse (50 to
14 100 μm) polygonal inclusion-rich non-ferroan low-magnesian calcite (LMC) crystals, which
15 either crosscuts the original fabric or develops following the host shell microstructures.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The observed moldic porosity probably results from the dissolution of aragonite and
27 high-magnesian calcite, which was not previously inverted in low-magnesian calcite (Figure
28 4D).
29
30
31
32
33

34 Dolomitization occurs in all the studied samples either through replacement or
35 cementation. The degree of dolomitization depends on the considered sample (Table 1).
36 Dolomite replacement is characterized by a unimodal dolomicrosparite, with crystals ranging
37 from 10 to 50 μm (Figure 4E) and showing a cloudy core and a more limpid overgrowth. More
38 rarely, dolomite cement is observed in moldic porosity. It exhibits a planar-e texture (mainly
39 euhedral crystals) with crystal sizes ranging from 100 to 200 μm (Figure 4F). Observation of
40 dolomite having affected syntaxial cement (Figure 4B) or developed in moldic porosity suggests
41 that the dolomitization process postdated these two phases.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For sample F2-2, an additional calcite cement phase is observed in moldic or shelter
4 porosity (Figure 4G, black arrow). It corresponds to a drusy pore-filling cement, composed of
5
6 equant subhedral non-ferroan calcite crystals (100 to 300 μm).
7
8
9

10
11 Finally, gypsum cement is scarcely observed in samples F2-4 and F2-7. It forms cloudy
12 inclusion-rich crystals, displaying a tabular to bladed anhedral habitus (Figure 4H, black arrow).
13
14 It develops in moldic porosity, partially or totally filling some molds.
15
16
17

18 19 EXPERIMENTAL CHARACTERIZATION: MICROSTRUCTURE INFORMATION AND 20 21 PETROACOUSTIC PROPERTIES 22 23 24

25 The mineral phases identified through the interpretation of XRD signals are calcite,
26 dolomite and silicate (grouping quartz and a small fraction of feldspars). Table 2 gives for each
27 studied sample the mineral content deduced from XRD analysis. The results are consistent with
28 the thin section analysis (Table 1). F1 samples show significant contents of both calcite and
29 dolomite and the largest silicate content of the two sample sets. Except for sample F2-2, F2
30 samples are predominantly dolomite samples, with small amounts of silicate. However, as no
31 quartz phase has been observed on thin sections, we do not considered a silicate phase in the
32 model describing Family 2.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The total porosity of the samples is deduced from the brine volume provided by the NMR
45 analysis of the brine-saturated samples and their bulk volume (Table 3). Additional porosity
46 measures are obtained from the difference between the brine-saturated and dry weights of the
47 samples. The comparison of the two measures shows that residual brine remains within the
48 sample after drying at 60°C (Bemer et al., 2018). Effective medium modeling considers all the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

18

1
2
3 saturated volume including even the less accessible pores and the consistent porosity values are
4
5 thus the NMR ones.
6
7

8
9 As described in our companion paper (Bemer et al., 2018), the microporosity and
10
11 macroporosity fractions reported in Table 3 have been determined from the combined
12
13 information derived from NMR and MICP analyses and microscanner imaging. The values
14
15 selected for effective medium modeling correspond to the volume fractions deduced from the
16
17 NMR T_2 distributions by applying a 200 ms threshold. A more reliable set of values deduced
18
19 from microscanner imaging is also provided for sample F1-13 which exhibits pore coupling
20
21 from microscanner imaging is also provided for sample F1-13 which exhibits pore coupling
22
23 (Fleury and Soualem, 2009).
24
25

26
27 Figure 6A plots the P-wave and S-wave velocities measured on the brine-saturated
28
29 samples as a function of porosity. The corresponding values are reported in Table 4. The
30
31 measurements on F1 and F2 samples have been performed at differential pressures equal to
32
33 respectively 25 MPa and 20 MPa and have not been impacted by weakening or dispersion
34
35 phenomena (Bemer et al., 2018). For a given porosity, F2 samples show higher P-wave and S-
36
37 wave velocities than F1 samples. At the first order it is related with higher contents of dolomite
38
39 in F2 samples. Dolomite having higher bulk and shear moduli than calcite (Table 2), velocities
40
41 are usually higher in dolomitic rocks than in calcite ones. Figure 6B represents the ultrasonic
42
43 measurements in a rock physics template: V_P/V_S ratio versus P-wave impedance $I_P = \rho V_P$.
44
45 Except for sample F1-17, F1 samples show higher V_P/V_S ratio than F2 samples. Both families
46
47 are clearly separated in the diagram implying that primary and secondary structures in these
48
49 carbonates have an incidence on their geophysical response.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The comparison of the measured velocities to the model developed by Xu and Payne (2009), especially in the more discriminating V_P/V_S versus I_P template provided for calcite and dolomite solid matrix by Zhao et al. (2013), suggests that flattened pores (with aspect ratios less than 0.15) would have to be taken into account in the model to reproduce the measured velocities. Such forms of inclusion not being observed on the thin sections, we choose to add a compliant interface to carbonate grains rather than use flattened porosity inclusions.

EFFECTIVE MODELING RESULTS

Family 1

As described in the petrographic analysis, F1 samples exhibit large scale calcitic mesoclots and a calcite cement forming the global rock frame, a dolomite cement developed between the calcite mesoclots, a framework porosity and micropores located both within the dolomite cement and the calcite mesoclots (Figure 2). The various characterizations performed on F1 samples have not provided quantitative data on the distribution of the micropores between their two host phases. As the dissolution step identified in the paragenesis mainly concerned the dolomite cement, we allocate the totality of the microporosity to this phase. This assumption can naturally be discussed, but additional data from high resolution SEM would be required to go further.

The microstructure model proposed for Family 1 is described in Figure 7A. It is based on a double scale approach. At the last diagenetic stage, the macroscopic scale consists in spherical grains of calcite with a compliant interface, quasi-equant macropores, spherical grains of quartz and microporous grains of dolomite. The microscopic scale corresponds to the microporous

1
2
3 grains which are composed of a dolomite matrix and quasi-equant micropores. The volume
4
5 fractions of these different phases having been determined for each sample (Table 2 and Table
6
7 3), this final model is first used to assess the normal and tangential stiffness of the interface
8
9 through inverse analysis of the measured brine-saturated velocities (Table 4).
10
11
12

13
14 Concerning the diagenetic evolution, we only take into account the events observed on all
15
16 the investigated samples during the petrographic analysis (Figure 8A). The initial state
17
18 corresponds to the end of the first diagenetic event identified in the petrographic analysis (Figure
19
20 3), *i.e.* the formation of the first phase of silica (Si. 1) and the development of the calcite cement.
21
22 At the beginning of our diagenesis modeling, the rock is then composed of calcite grains with a
23
24 compliant interface (representing the rock frame composed of calcite mesoclots and syntaxial
25
26 cement), macropores and amorphous quartz. This first stage corresponds to the early induration
27
28 by cementation. We assume a total initial porosity of 40% which is a classical value for
29
30 carbonate muds (Eberli et al., 2003). A small volume fraction of 1% is taken for the Si. 1 phase.
31
32
33
34

35
36 Three main diagenetic events are then considered (Figure 8A). Firstly, dolomite cement
37
38 precipitates into the macroporosity of the initial calcite framework (Stage 1: dolomitization).
39
40 Then, newly dolomite grains are dissolved and become microporous (Stage 2: dissolution).
41
42 During this stage, dolomite grains become the second effective medium model embedded within
43
44 the first one composed of calcite grains, macropores and amorphous quartz. Finally, quartz
45
46 cement precipitates into the residual macroporosity (Stage 3: cementation).
47
48
49

50
51 The corresponding evolutions of the total porosity, the macroporosity and the
52
53 microporosity are represented in Figure 9. During stage 1, the total porosity decreases due to a
54
55 reduction of the macroporosity associated to the increase in dolomite content (dolomite
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

21

1 precipitation). During stage 2, the total porosity increases due to the creation of microporosity
2
3 within the dolomite grains, while the macroporosity remains constant. Finally, during stage 3, the
4
5 total porosity decreases due to the precipitation of quartz into the residual macroporosity (the
6
7 microporosity remains constant). The total porosity level at the end of stage 1 corresponds to the
8
9 macroporosity level maintained during stage 2 before the beginning of quartz cementation in
10
11 stage 3. Sample F1-21 is characterized by the highest values of total porosity and macroporosity
12
13 together with a low quartz content. It has then been considered as representative of the end of
14
15 stage 2 and its porosity values have been used to constrain the constant macroporosity level of
16
17 stage 2 and the constant microporosity level of stage 3, respectively set to 15% and 6.5%. The
18
19 four other samples are then reported on the porosity evolution curves according to their total
20
21 porosity and their fractions of macroporosity and microporosity (Figure 9) and thus attributed a
22
23 position on the arbitrary time scale. The two positions proposed for sample F1-13 correspond to
24
25 the macroporosity and microporosity fractions derived from NMR (filled markers) and
26
27 microscanner imaging (white markers).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 All the model parameters are then known and we can use direct effective medium
37 modeling to compute the evolution of elastic wave velocities during the diagenesis. The red
38 curves in Figure 10A report the results obtained for Family 1 in a velocity – porosity diagram.
39 The comparison with the measured velocities illustrates the quality of the calibration. Figure 10B
40 presents the temporal evolution of the elastic velocities during diagenesis. Ultrasonic
41 measurements have been reported on the velocity curves using the time calibration described
42 above. The first diagenetic stage is associated with a sharp increase of elastic velocities,
43 corresponding to the filling of macropores with dolomite crystals. Then the dissolution of
44 dolomite grains leads to a slight decrease of velocities. Finally the quartz cementation increases
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

22

1
2
3 once again the velocities. Experimental data fit well with the model curves. As sample F1-21,
4
5 sample F1-17 seems to be representative of the beginning of stage 3, while samples F1-12 and
6
7 F1-15 appear as more representative of the end of stage 3. These observations are in accordance
8
9 with their relative quartz contents. Sample F1-13 shows a very low quartz content, which would
10
11 be contradictory with its positioning at the end of stage 3 as would have been implied by the
12
13 macroporosity and microporosity fractions derived from NMR data impacted by pore coupling.
14
15 The use of the values derived from microscanner imaging (white markers) results in a shifting
16
17 towards early times more consistent with the low quartz content of sample F1-13. These results
18
19 show that reliable assessment of the macroporosity and microporosity fractions is of paramount
20
21 importance.
22
23
24
25

Family 2

26
27
28
29
30
31 As described in the petrographic analysis, F2 samples are dolomitized bioclastic
32
33 wackestone to packstone. The matrix is selectively dolomitized. Porosity is split into moldic
34
35 macropores and intercrystalline micropores within the dolomitized matrix. The microstructure
36
37 model proposed for Family 2 is once again a double scale effective medium model (Figure 7B).
38
39 At the last diagenetic stage, the macroscopic scale consists in a calcite matrix, representing both
40
41 non-dolomitized grains of neomorphic calcite (resulting from the HMC/aragonite inversion
42
43 diagenetic phase) and syntaxial cement, quasi equant macropores (aspect ratio equal to 0.8) and
44
45 microporous grains of dolomite with a compliant interface. The microscopic scale corresponds to
46
47 the dolomite microporous grains composed of a dolomite matrix and quasi equant micropores
48
49 (aspect ratio equal to 0.8). As for Family 1, this final model is used to assess the normal and
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

23

1
2
3 tangential stiffness of the interface through inverse analysis of the measured brine-saturated
4
5 velocities.
6
7
8

9 In terms of diagenesis, the petrographic analysis has identified different main diagenetic
10 phases (Figure 5). Besides, NMR measurements clearly show that the replacing dolomite is
11 microporous; we have thus added another possible diagenetic step corresponding to the
12 dissolution of dolomite (which could have occurred at the same time than the replacement of
13 calcite by dolomite). Our diagenesis modeling begins with a tight carbonate rock whose porosity
14 has been occluded by the development of syntaxial cement and which has thus already
15 experienced some diagenetic processes after sedimentation. Three diagenetic phases which
16 create porosity into the rock are then considered (Figure 8B). Firstly, macroporosity is created
17 into the calcite matrix (Stage 1: dissolution). Then part of the initial calcite grains are replaced by
18 dolomite grains with no change in porosity (Stage 2: replacement). Finally dolomite grains are
19 partially dissolved resulting in the creation of microporosity (Stage 3: dissolution). The total
20 porosity at the end of stage 1 corresponds to the constant macroporosity assumed for stage 3.
21 Sample F2-2 is the lowest porosity sample and its porosity level is close to the mean
22 macroporosity of the whole sample set which has been used to define the constant macroporosity
23 level of 7% for stage 3. This sample has then been considered as representative of the beginning
24 of stage 3. The five other samples have then been reported on the porosity evolution curves
25 according to their total porosity.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The blue curves in Figure 9B summarizes the evolution of the total porosity, the
50 microporosity and the macroporosity for F2 model. Once again we observe a good agreement
51 when we compare the elastic waves velocities computed through direct effective medium
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

24

1
2
3 modeling to the experimental data (blue data in Figure 10A). Finally, Figure 10C presents the
4 evolution of the elastic velocities during diagenesis together with the measured velocities
5 reported according to the above-described time calibration. Due to the different initial states
6 considered for the diagenesis modeling, the modeled range of velocity evolution is smaller for
7 Family 2 than for Family 1. Indeed, the initial state considered for Family 1 corresponds to the
8 initial carbonate mud with a high porosity level whereas the initial state considered for Family 2
9 corresponds to a more advanced state in the sediment history associated to a low-porosity rock.
10 The creation of macroporosity during stage 1 is naturally associated with a velocity decrease.
11 The replacement of calcite by dolomite during stage 2 leads to an increase in P- and S-wave
12 velocities, as previously intuited from the comparison of the experimental ultrasonic data
13 obtained on F1 and F2 samples. Finally the transformation of the dolomite phase into
14 microporous grains during stage 3 leads to a relatively sharp velocity decrease. As expected from
15 their different porosity levels, sample F2-4 appears to be representative of an intermediate
16 diagenetic state between sample F2-2 (beginning of stage 3) and samples F2-3, F2-5, F2-6 and
17 F2-7 (end of Stage 3).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 DISCUSSION

42
43
44 The temporal calibration phase of the effective medium model is the most difficult to
45 achieve due to the different diagenesis phases recorded on a same thin section for which only
46 relative timings are available. Due to the lack of data on the absolute date of each diagenetic
47 event, the time evolution is obviously arbitrary at the moment. To tackle this issue advanced
48 petrographic analysis could be added to the experimental characterization workflow, such as the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 characterization of carbonate U-Pb isotopes via laser ablation, to obtain absolute timing for each
4
5 diagenesis phase (Vahrenkamp et al., 2014; Mangenot et al., 2018). As this is not the primary
6
7 objective of this paper, we choose to display the modeling results in a rock physics template that
8
9 does not involve time. Figure 11 plots the evolution of the elastic properties together with the
10
11 experimental results in the standard V_p/V_s ratio versus P-wave impedance template.
12
13
14

15
16 The modeling results provided for F1 carbonate formation do not show distinct area for
17
18 each diagenetic stage. The end of stage 1 and stages 2 and 3 are associated to V_p/V_s ratios within
19
20 the measurement error. Moreover, in this representation, the experimental data somewhat deviate
21
22 from the modeling data. On the contrary, the different stages characterizing the diagenesis of F2
23
24 carbonate formation clearly follow a specific path within the $I_p - V_p/V_s$ space. The six F2
25
26 samples are located at the end of the diagenetic path, according to the time calibration based on
27
28 porosity and velocity data. Samples F2-2 and F2-4 appear to be representative of an earlier stage
29
30 of diagenesis, such as previously described. Note that sample F2-2 is the most cemented sample
31
32 which could explain the higher observed discrepancy.
33
34
35
36
37

38 One key question remains open: can the experimental velocities measured on the studied
39
40 samples be considered as having been only differently affected during the last diagenetic stage or
41
42 are they the integration of all the successive diagenetic processes experienced more or less
43
44 intensely by the samples? The second option is naturally more likely and could explain some
45
46 differences observed for F1 samples. To implement the proposed approach in a more consistent
47
48 way, we will have to consider additional information from basin modeling to assess the residence
49
50 time of each sample within the different diagenetic stages.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, to explore further avenues, we test the possibility of predicting the evolution of
4 permeability during diagenesis based on our effective medium modeling approach. Numerous
5 much more adapted approaches exist in the literature to model permeability in rocks (*e.g.* Dou et
6 al., 2011; Ba et al., 2013). But our objective is to predict permeability using microstructural
7 models well constrained by geological and mechanical data. The idea is only to replace pure
8 phase mechanical parameters by flow parameters (permeability) (Table 5). Effective medium
9 modeling is then applied to calculate a homogenized permeability tensor at the macroscale
10 (Barthélémy, 2009). Figure 12 presents the results of this extrapolation to permeability
11 prediction. No calibration with experimental data has been performed here. The only objective is
12 to illustrate the impact of the different diagenetic stages on the permeability response.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 CONCLUSION

28
29
30 It is generally difficult to properly model acoustic properties of carbonate rocks due to the
31 numerous control factors. We base our modeling approach on an extensive experimental dataset
32 that we use to constrain the conceptual effective medium model and assess the microscopic
33 properties. Contrary to standard approach, we do not introduce compliant pores in our model to
34 reproduce the measured velocity, which is consistent with the observations on thin sections. We
35 reproduce the grain contact behavior by adding a compliant interface to carbonate grains. The
36 normal and tangential stiffness of this interface are determined through inverse analysis of the
37 measured elastic velocity. We then perform direct calculations to define velocity – porosity
38 trends during diagenesis.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Our approach has to be improved by adding other experimental constraints, such as real
54 timing of diagenetic stages. However, it appears as a simple but realistic approach to fill the gap
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

between the petrophysical evolution of carbonates during diagenesis and their elastic properties.

All parts of a carbonate formation have not been affected by the same diagenetic events. This approach could then be used to test the impact of different diagenesis scenarios on the elastic response of carbonate rocks. Results of such modeling could provide improved input data to perform synthetic seismic from stratigraphic models populated with velocity data.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Adam, L., Batzle, M., Brevik, I., 2006, Gassmann's fluid substitution and shear modulus
10 variability in carbonates at laboratory seismic and ultrasonic frequencies: *Geophysics*, **71(6)**,
11 173–183.
12
13
14

15
16
17 Adelinet, M., Fortin, J., Guéguen, Y., Schubnel, A. and Geoffroy, L., 2010, Frequency
18 and fluid effects on elastic properties of basalt: Experimental investigations: *Geophysical*
19 *Research Letters*, **37(2)**.
20
21
22
23

24
25 Adelinet, M., Fortin, J., Schubnel, A. and Guéguen, Y., 2013, Deformation modes in an
26 Icelandic basalt: From brittle failure to localized deformation bands: *Journal of Volcanology and*
27 *Geothermal Research*, **255**, 15-25.
28
29
30
31

32
33 Alvarez J. P. G., 2007, Effect of microstructure and pore fluid on the elastic properties of
34 carbonate rocks: PhD Thesis, University of Oklahoma.
35
36
37

38
39 Ba, J., Cao, H., Carcione, J. M., Tang, G., Yan, X. F., Sun, W. T. and Nie, J. X., 2013,
40 Multiscale rock-physics templates for gas detection in carbonate reservoirs: *Journal of Applied*
41 *Geophysics*, **93**, 77-82.
42
43
44
45

46
47 Baechle, G. T., Colpaert, A., Eberli, G. P. and Weger, R. J., 2008, Effects of
48 microporosity on sonic velocity in carbonate rocks: *The Leading Edge*, **27(8)**, 1012-1018.
49
50
51

52
53 Barthélémy, J. F., 2005, Approche micromécanique de la rupture et de la fissuration dans
54 les géomatériaux: PhD Thesis (in French), Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

29

1
2
3 Barthélémy, J. F., 2009, Effective permeability of media with a dense network of long
4 and micro fractures: *Transport in porous media*, **76(1)**, 153-178.

5
6
7
8 Baud, P., Vinciguerra, S., David, C., Cavallo, A., Walker, E. and Reuschlé, T., 2009,
9 Compaction and failure in high porosity carbonates: Mechanical data and microstructural
10 observations: *Pure appl. geophys.*, **166**, 869–898.

11
12
13 Bemer, E., Hamon, Y. and Adelinet, M., 2017, Integrated Characterization Workflow to
14 Assess Diagenesis Impact on the Petrophysical and Petroacoustic Properties of Carbonate
15 Reservoirs, *in* M. Vandamme, J.-M. Pereira, P. Dangla and S. Ghabezlo eds., *Poromechanics VI:*
16 *Proceedings of the Sixth Biot Conference on Poromechanics, 1884-1891.*

17
18 Bemer, E., Adelinet, M. and Hamon, Y., 2018, Consistent experimental investigation of
19 the applicability of Biot-Gassmann's equation in carbonates, *Geophysics*, **this issue**.

20
21 Brigaud, B., Vincent, B., Durllet, C., Deconinck, J.-F., Blanc, P. and Trouiller, A., 2010,
22 Acoustic Properties of Ancient Shallow-Marine Carbonates: Effects of Depositional
23 Environments and Diagenetic Processes (Middle Jurassic, Paris Basin, France): *Journal of*
24 *Sedimentary Research* **80**, 791-807.

25
26 Cadoret, T., Marion, D. and Zinszner, B., 1995, Influence of frequency and fluid
27 distribution on elastic wave velocities in partially saturated limestones: *J. Geophys. Res.*,
28 **100(B6)**, 9789-9803.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

30

1
2
3 Carpentier, C., Ferry, S., Lécuyer, C., Strasser, A., Géraud, Y. and Trouiller, A., 2015,
4
5 Origin of micropores in late Jurassic (Oxfordian) micrites of the Eastern Paris Basin, France:
6
7 Journal of Sedimentary Research, **85(6)**, 660-682.
8
9

10
11 Casteleyn, L., Robion, P., Collin, P.-Y., Menéndez, B., David, C., Desaubliaux, G.,
12
13 Fernandes, N., Dreux, R., Badiner, G. and Brosse, E., 2010, Interrelations of the petrophysical,
14
15 sedimentological and microstructural properties of the Oolithe Blanche Formation (Bathonian,
16
17 saline aquifer of the Paris Basin): Sedimentary Geology, **230**, 123-138.
18
19

20
21 Casteleyn, L., Robion, P., David, C., Collin, P.-Y., Menéndez, B., Fernandes, N.,
22
23 Desaubliaux, G. and Rigollet, C., 2011, An integrated study of the petrophysical properties of
24
25 carbonate rocks from the "Oolithe Blanche" formation in the Paris Basin: Tectonophysics, **503**,
26
27 18-33.
28
29

30
31 Choquette P.W. and Pray L.C., 1970, Geologic nomenclature and classification of
32
33 porosity in sedimentary carbonates: AAPG Bulletin, **54**, 207-244.
34
35
36

37
38 Clark, A. C. and Vanorio, T. (2016). The rock physics and geochemistry of carbonates
39
40 exposed to reactive brines: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, **121(3)**, 1497-1513.
41
42

43
44 Dickson J.A.D., 1966, Carbonate identification and genesis as revealed by staining:
45
46 Journal of Sedimentary Petrology, **36(2)**, 491-505.
47
48

49
50 Dou, Q., Sun, Y. and Sullivan, C., 2011, Rock-physics-based carbonate pore type
51
52 characterization and reservoir permeability heterogeneity evaluation, Upper San Andres
53
54 reservoir, Permian Basin, west Texas: Journal of Applied Geophysics, **74(1)**, 8-18.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

31

1
2
3 Dunham R.J., 1962, Classification of Carbonate Rocks according to depositional texture,
4
5 *in* W.E. Ham, eds., Classification of Carbonate Rocks: AAPG Memoir, **1**, 108-121.
6

7
8
9 Dvorkin, J., Mavko, G. and Nur A., 1995, Squirt flow in fully saturated rocks:
10
11 Geophysics, **60(1)**, 97-107.
12

13
14 Eberli, G. P., Baechle, G. T., Anselmetti, F. S. and Incze, M. L., 2003, Factors controlling
15
16 elastic properties in carbonate sediments and rocks: The Leading Edge, **22(7)**, 654-660.
17

18
19
20 Eiler, J. M., 2011, Paleoclimate reconstruction using carbonate clumped isotope
21
22 thermometry: Quaternary Science Reviews, **30(25-26)**, 3575-3588.
23

24
25
26 Esheiby, J.D., 1957, The determination of the elastic field of an ellipsoidal inclusion, and
27
28 related problems: Proc. Roy. Soc. London, 376-396.
29

30
31
32 Fleury M. and Soualem J., 2009, Quantitative analysis of diffusional pore coupling from
33
34 T₂-store-T₂ NMR experiments: J. Coll. Inter. Sciences, **336**.
35

36
37
38 Fournier, F., Pellerin, M., Villeneuve, Q., Teillet, T., Hong, F., Poli, E., Borgomano, J.,
39
40 Léonide P. and Hairabian, A., 2018, The equivalent pore aspect ratio as a tool for pore type
41
42 prediction in carbonate reservoirs: AAPG Bulletin, **102(7)**, 1343-1377.
43

44
45
46 Heydari, E., 2003, Meteoric versus burial control on porosity evolution of the Smackover
47
48 Formation. AAPG Bulletin, **87(11)**, 1779-1797.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kelts, K. and Talbot, M., 1990, Lacustrine carbonates as geochemical archives of
4 environmental change and biotic/abiotic interactions, *in* M.M. Tiizer and C. Serruya, eds., Large
5 Lakes: Brock/Springer Series in Contemporary Bioscience, 288-315.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Lambert, L., Durllet, C., Loreau, J.-P. and Marnier, G., 2006, Burial dissolution of micrite
12 in Middle East carbonate reservoirs (Jurassic-Cretaceous): keys for recognition and timing:
13
14 Marine and Petroleum Geology **23**, 79-92.
15
16

17
18
19 Lønøy, A., 2006, Making sense of carbonate pore system: AAPG Bulletin, **90(9)**, 1381-
20
21 1405.
22
23

24
25 Makhloufi, Y., Collin, P.-Y., Bergerat, F., Casteleyn, L., Claes, S., David, C., Menéndez,
26 B., Monna, F., Robion, P. and Sizun, J.-P., 2013, Impact of sedimentology and diagenesis on the
27 petrophysical properties of a tight oolitic carbonate reservoir. The case of the Oolithe Blanche
28 Formation (Bathonian, Paris Basin, France): Mar. Pet. Geol., **48**, 323-340.
29
30
31

32
33
34
35 Manganot, X., Gasparrini, M., Rouchon, V. and Bonifacie, M., 2018, Basin-scale thermal
36 and fluid flow histories revealed by carbonate clumped isotopes ($\Delta 47$)—Middle Jurassic
37 carbonates of the Paris Basin depocentre: Sedimentology, **65(1)**, 123-150.
38
39
40

41
42
43 Matonti, C., Guglielmi, Y., Viseur, S., Bruna, P. O., Borgomano, J., Dahl, C. and Marié,
44 L., 2015, Heterogeneities and diagenetic control on the spatial distribution of carbonate rocks
45 acoustic properties at the outcrop scale: Tectonophysics, **638**, 94-111.
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 Matonti, C., Bourget, J., Fournier, F., Riera, R., Haig, D., Håkansson, E., Pellerin, M.,
53
54 Hong, F. and Reijmer, J., 2016, Impact of Contrasted Diagenetic History on the Pore Type and
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

33

1
2
3 Acoustic Properties Acquisition of Non-Tropical Carbonates (Cape Range, Western Australia):

4
5 AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts.

6
7
8
9 Mavko, G., Mukerji, T. and Dvorkin, J., 1998, The Rock Physics handbook: Tools for
10 seismic analysis in porous media: Cambridge University Press.

11
12
13
14 Nader, F., Champenois, F., Barbier, M., Adelinet, M., Rosenberg, E., Houel, P., Delmas,
15 J. and Swennen, R., 2016, Diagenetic effects of compaction on reservoir properties: The case of
16 Lower Callovian "Dalle Nacrée" Formation (Paris Basin, France): Journal of Geodynamics, **101**,
17 5-29.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 Neveux, L., Grgic, D., Carpentier, C., Pironon, J., Truche, L. and Girard, J. P., 2014,
26 Experimental simulation of chemomechanical processes during deep burial diagenesis of
27 carbonate rocks: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, **119(2)**, 984-1007.

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467

Geophysics

34

1
2
3 Regnet, J. B., Robion, P., David, C., Fortin, J., Brigaud, B. and Yven, B., 2015a, Acoustic
4 and reservoir properties of microporous carbonate rocks: Implication of micrite particle size and
5 morphology: *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, **120(2)**, 790-811.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Regnet, J. B., David, C., Fortin, J., Robion, P., Makhloufi, Y. and Collin, P. Y., 2015b,
12 Influence of microporosity distribution on the mechanical behavior of oolitic carbonate rocks:
13 *Geomechanics for Energy and the Environment*, **3**, 11-23.
14
15

16
17
18
19 Regnet, J.B., Fortin, J., Nicolas, A., Pellerin, M. and Guéguen, Y., 2018, Elastic
20 properties of continental carbonate analogs: from controlling factors to an applicable model for
21 acoustic velocity predictions. *Geophysics*, accepted.
22
23

24
25
26
27 Riding, R., 1991, Classification of microbial carbonates, *in* R. Riding, ed., *Calcareous*
28 *algae and stromatolites*, Springer, 21-51.
29
30

31
32
33 Sibley, D. F. and Gregg, J., 1987, Classification of Dolomite Rock Texture: *Journal of*
34 *sedimentary petrology*, **57**, 967-975.
35
36

37
38
39 Vahrenkamp, V., Barata, J., Van Laer, P. J., Swart, P. and Murray, S., 2014, Micro
40 Rhombic Calcite of a Giant Barremian (Thamama B) Reservoir Onshore Abu Dhabi-Clumped
41 Isotope Analyses fix Temperature, Water Composition and Timing of Burial Diagenesis: SPE-
42 172033-MS.
43
44
45

46
47
48
49 Vajdova, V., Baud, P. and Wong, T. F., 2004, Compaction, dilatancy, and failure in
50 porous carbonate rocks: *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, **109(B5)**.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Geophysics 35

2
3 Verwer, K., Braaksma, H. and Kenter, J. A., 2008, Acoustic properties of carbonates:
4 Effects of rock texture and implications for fluid substitution: *Geophysics*, **73(2)**, B51-B65.
5
6

7
8 Vincent B., Fleury M., Santerre Y. and Brigaud B., 2011, NMR relaxation of neritic
9 carbonates: an integrated petrophysical and petrographical approach. *Journal of Applied*
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Xu, S. and Payne, M. A., 2009, Modeling elastic properties in carbonate rocks: *The*
Leading Edge, **28(1)**, 66-74.

Xu, S.Y. and White, R.E., 1996, A physical model for shear-wave velocity prediction:
Geophysical Prospecting, **44**, 687–717.

Zhao, L., Nasser, M. and Han, D., 2013, Quantitative geophysical pore-type
characterization and its geological implication in carbonate reservoirs: *Geophysical Prospecting*,
61, 827–841.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Quantitative estimation of the different components observed in the scanned thin sections. Proportions within bracket are normalized with respect to the solid content (i.e. by removing the porosity from the calculations).....	36
Table 2. Sample mineral contents deduced from XRD analysis (expressed in volume fraction over the solid part).....	36
Table 3. Total porosity and fractions of microporosity and macroporosity deduced from NMR measurements. Values in bracket provided for sample F1-13 correspond to the microporosity and macroporosity fractions derived from microscanner imaging.	37
Table 4. Ultrasonic velocities measured on brine-saturated samples.	37
Table 5. Pure phase moduli used in the effective medium approach (Mavko et al., 1998) and arbitrary permeability attributed to these phases.	38

Tables

Geophysics

36

Table 1. Quantitative estimation of the different components observed in the scanned thin sections. Proportions within bracket are normalized with respect to the solid content (i.e. by removing the porosity from the calculations).

Sample	Calcite	Dolomite	Quartz	Resolved porosity
F1-12	64% (75% norm.)	21% (24% norm.)	<1% (1% norm.)	14%
F1-13	81% (94% norm.)	4% (5% norm.)	<1% (1% norm.)	14%
F1-15	80% (87% norm.)	11% (12% norm.)	<1% (1% norm.)	8%
F1-17	67% (82% norm.)	13% (16% norm.)	<1% (1% norm.)	18%
F1-21	76% (84% norm.)	14% (15% norm.)	<1% (1% norm.)	9%
F2-2	27% (27% norm.)	73% (73% norm.)	0% (0% norm.)	0.4%
F2-3	3% (3% norm.)	94% (97% norm.)	0% (0% norm.)	3%
F2-4	1% (1% norm.)	95% (99% norm.)	0% (0% norm.)	4%
F2-5	1% (1% norm.)	97% (99% norm.)	0% (0% norm.)	2%
F2-6	0% (0% norm.)	95% (100% norm.)	0% (0% norm.)	5%
F2-7	0% (0% norm.)	95% (100% norm.)	0% (0% norm.)	5%

Table 2. Sample mineral contents deduced from XRD analysis (expressed in volume fraction over the solid part).

Sample	Calcite	Dolomite	Silicate	
F1	12	52.1%	36.1%	11.8%
	13	78.3%	19.3%	2.4%
	15	67.6%	25.0%	7.4%
	17	81.0%	12.7%	6.3%
	21	82.4%	13.5%	4.1%
F2	2	41.5%	56.2%	2.3%
	3	8.4%	88.3%	3.4%
	4	0.1%	96.5%	3.4%
	5	2.5%	93.6%	3.9%
	6	0.1%	95.6%	4.3%
	7	0.1%	95.9%	4.0%

Table 3. Total porosity and fractions of microporosity and macroporosity deduced from NMR measurements. Values in bracket provided for sample F1-13 correspond to the microporosity and macroporosity fractions derived from microscanner imaging.

Sample	NMR porosity	NMR microporosity fraction	NMR macroporosity fraction	
F1	12	14.1%	39%	61%
	13	15.3%	53% (27% μ CT)	47% (73% μ CT)
	15	15.1%	32%	69%
	17	18.9%	35%	65%
	21	21.7%	27%	73%
F2	2	6.7%	77%	23%
	3	20.3%	54%	47%
	4	15.3%	53%	47%
	5	19.5%	78%	22%
	6	22.8%	58%	42%
	7	21.4%	56%	44%

Table 4. Ultrasonic velocities measured on brine-saturated samples.

Sample	Density (g/cm ³)	V_P (km/s)	V_S (km/s)	
F1	12	2.428	5.024	2.656
	13	2.413	4.902	2.536
	15	2.378	4.760	2.526
	17	2.363	4.622	2.580
	21	2.308	4.353	2.225
F2	2	2.645	5.529	2.990
	3	2.46	4.824	2.669
	4	2.556	5.284	2.925
	5	2.464	4.803	2.639
	6	2.434	4.607	2.571

7	2.453	4.721	2.655
---	-------	-------	-------

Table 5. Pure phase moduli used in the effective medium approach (Mavko et al., 1998) and arbitrary permeability attributed to these phases.

Mineral phase	Bulk modulus (GPa)	Shear modulus (GPa)	Permeability (mD)
Calcite	77	32	$1 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Dolomite	95	45	$1 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Quartz	38	44	$1 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Liquid water	2.3	0	$1 \cdot 10^6$ (permeability of pores)
Grain interface	Derived from inversion of experimental data		1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. General methodology proposed to model the evolution of carbonate elastic properties during diagenesis..... 39

Figure 2. Petrographic overview of F1 samples (transmitted light plane-polarized photomicrographs). 41

Figure 3. Tentative paragenesis for Family 1..... 41

Figure 4. Petrographic overview of F2 samples (transmitted light plane-polarized photomicrographs). 43

Figure 5. Tentative paragenesis for Family 2..... 43

Figure 6. Ultrasonic velocity measurements performed on brine-saturated F1 and F2 samples from family. A: P- and S-wave velocities versus porosity. B: $VPVS$ ratio versus P-wave impedance..... 43

Figure 7. Conceptual effective medium models evolving with diagenesis..... 44

Figure 8. Petrographic analysis: selected staining thin sections of F1 and F2 samples illustrating the different key diagenetic events. 45

Figure 9. Total, macro and microporosity evolution during diagenesis modeling. Data are displayed in red for F1 carbonates and in blue for F2 carbonates..... 46

Figure 10. Modeling of elastic wave velocities during diagenesis. A: Comparison between model and experimental data in a P-wave velocity versus total porosity diagram. B and C: Evolution of P-wave (bright colors) and S-wave velocities (light colors) during diagenesis. Experimental data are marked as circles for F1 and triangles for F2. 47

Figure 11. Representation of modeling results in $VPVS$ versus I_p rock physics template. The main diagenetic stages are represented with arrows. Experimental data are marked as circles for F1 samples and triangles for F2 samples. 48

Figure 12. Extrapolation to permeability modeling using the same effective medium model evolution..... 49

Figures





Figure 1. General methodology proposed to model the evolution of carbonate elastic properties during diagenesis.

Geophysics

40

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Geophysics

Figure 2. Petrographic overview of F1 samples (transmitted light plane-polarized photomicrographs).




Figure 3. Tentative paragenesis for Family 1.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Geophysics

42

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 4. Petrographic overview of F2 samples (transmitted light plane-polarized photomicrographs).




Figure 5. Tentative paragenesis for Family 2.




Figure 6. Ultrasonic velocity measurements performed on brine-saturated F1 and F2 samples from family. A: P- and S-wave velocities versus porosity. B: V_p/V_s ratio versus P-wave impedance.





Figure 7. Conceptual effective medium models evolving with diagenesis.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A. Samples F1



DIAGENETIC EVENTS	Early → Late
Cementation (C1)	
Dolomitization	
Dissolution of the dolomite	
Quartz Cement. (S2)	

B. Samples F2



DIAGENETIC EVENTS	Early → Late
Syntaxial cement / replacement	
Dissolution	
Dolomite replacement	
Dissolution	

Figure 8. Petrographic analysis: selected staining thin sections of F1 and F2 samples illustrating the different key diagenetic events.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 9. Total, macro and microporosity evolution during diagenesis modeling. Data are displayed in red for F1 carbonates and in blue for F2 carbonates.




Figure 10. Modeling of elastic wave velocities during diagenesis. A: Comparison between model and experimental data in a P-wave velocity versus total porosity diagram. B and C: Evolution of P-wave (bright colors) and S-wave velocities (light colors) during diagenesis. Experimental data are marked as circles for F1 and triangles for F2.




Figure 11. Representation of modeling results in V_P/V_S versus I_P rock physics template. The main diagenetic stages are represented with arrows. Experimental data are marked as circles for F1 samples and triangles for F2 samples.




Figure 12. Extrapolation to permeability modeling using the same effective medium model evolution.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60