Relating Darcy-scale chemical reaction order to pore-scale spatial heterogeneity

Po-Wei Huang¹, Bernd Flemisch², Chaozhong Qin³, Martin Oliver Saar¹, and Anozie Ebigbo⁴

¹ETH Zurich ²University of Stuttgart ³Chongqing University ⁴Helmut Schmidt University

November 22, 2022

Abstract

Due to spatial scaling effects, there is a discrepancy in mineral dissolution rates in porous media measured at different spatial scales. Many reasons for this spatial scaling effect can be given. We investigate one such reason, i.e. how pore-scale spatial heterogeneity in porous media affects overall mineral dissolution rates. Using the bundle-of-tubes model as an analogy for porous media, we show that the Darcy-scale reaction order increases as the statistical similarity between the pore sizes and the effective-surface-area ratio of the porous sample decreases. The analytical results quantify mineral spatial heterogeneity using the Darcy-scale reaction order and give a mechanistic explanation to the usage of reaction order in Darcy-scale modeling. The relation is used as a constitutive relation of reactive transport at the Darcy scale. We test the constitutive relation by simulating flow-through experiments. The proposed constitutive relation is able to model the solute breakthrough curve of the simulations. In addition, our results imply that we can infer mineral spatial heterogeneity of a porous mediam using measured solute concentration over time in a flow-through dissolution experiment.

Relating Darcy-scale chemical reaction order to pore-scale spatial heterogeneity

Po-Wei Huang¹, Bernd Flemisch², Chao-Zhong Qin³, Martin O. Saar^{1,4}, Anozie Ebigbo^{1,5}

¹Geothermal Energy and Geofluids Group, Institute of Geophysics, Department of Earth Sciences, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland ²Institute for Modelling Hydraulic and Environmental Systems, University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart,

Germany

³State Key Laboratory of Coal Mine Disaster Dynamics and Control, Chongqing University, Chongqing, China

⁴Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA ⁵Hydromechanics Research Group, Helmut Schmidt University, Hamburg, Germany

Key Points:

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14	•	We derive relationships between raw moments of pore-size, effective surface area
15		distributions and the Darcy-scale reaction order.
16	•	The Darcy-scale reaction order, independent of Péclet and Damköhler numbers,
17		serves as a constitutive relation for Darcy-scale modeling.
18	•	We use simulations of flow-through experiments at both lab and field scales to
19		demonstrate the utility of the constitutive relation.

Corresponding author: Po-Wei Huang, powei.huang@erdw.ethz.ch

Corresponding author: Anozie Ebigbo, ebigbo@hsu-hh.de

20 Abstract

Due to spatial scaling effects, there is a discrepancy in mineral dissolution rates in 21 porous media measured at different spatial scales. Many reasons for this spatial scal-22 ing effect can be given. We investigate one such reason, i.e. how pore-scale spa-23 tial heterogeneity in porous media affects overall mineral dissolution rates. Using 24 the bundle-of-tubes model as an analogy for porous media, we show that the Darcy-25 scale reaction order increases as the statistical similarity between the pore sizes and 26 the effective-surface-area ratio of the porous sample decreases. The analytical results 27 quantify mineral spatial heterogeneity using the Darcy-scale reaction order and give a 28 mechanistic explanation to the usage of reaction order in Darcy-scale modeling. The 29 relation is used as a constitutive relation of reactive transport at the Darcy scale. We 30 test the constitutive relation by simulating flow-through experiments. The proposed 31 constitutive relation is able to model the solute breakthrough curve of the simula-32 tions. In addition, our results imply that we can infer mineral spatial heterogeneity 33 of a porous medium using measured solute concentration over time in a flow-through 34 dissolution experiment. 35

³⁶ 1 Introduction

Geochemical reactions such as mineral dissolution play an essential role in de-37 termining water chemistry, soil formation, biogeochemical cycling, and global climate 38 (Wen & Li, 2017). Mineral reactions can also occur during injection of CO₂ in ground-39 water reservoirs (Ebigbo et al., 2012; Buscheck et al., 2014; Pogge von Strandmann 40 et al., 2019). One of the most significant obstacles to understanding the geochemi-41 cal reactivity of natural subsurface environments stems from the multitude of spatial 42 scales that have to be considered (Noiriel et al., 2012). Due to spatial scaling effects, 43 mineral dissolution rates are known to be 3–6 orders of magnitude lower in the field 44 than when measured in the laboratory (White & Brantley, 2003; Navarre-Sitchler & 45 Brantley, 2007; Maher, 2010; Moore et al., 2012). The deviation in mineral dissolution 46 rates strongly limits the extrapolation of kinetic dissolution models and parameters 47 characterized in the laboratory to natural systems (R. Li et al., 2020). 48

Many factors are responsible for the spatial scaling effects of mineral dissolution 49 rates. This work focuses on how pore-size distribution—which contributes to hydraulic 50 heterogeneity—and spatial mineral distribution cause such spatial scaling effects. L. Li 51 et al. (2007) performed simulations with various settings of spatial mineral distribution 52 and concluded that spatial mineral distribution has a significant scaling effect when the 53 reactive minerals are of small but typical proportions. Experimental studies using a 54 column packed with quartz and magnesite have confirmed the significant role of spatial 55 heterogeneities in subsurface reactive transport and can be used to quantify the effect 56 of spatial mineral distribution on dissolution rates (L. Li et al., 2013, 2014; L. Li & 57 Salehikhoo, 2015). X-ray micro-tomography provides observations of the impact of 58 physical and chemical heterogeneity on reaction rates in multimineral porous media 59 (Al-Khulaifi et al., 2017, 2018, 2019; Menke et al., 2016, 2018). Fischer et al. (2014) 60 and Fischer and Luttge (2017) studied how mineral surface roughness at the nanometer 61 scale affects surface reaction rates and proposed to upscale the mineral reaction rate 62 using Monte-Carlo simulations. Ma et al. (2021) quantified the accessible surface area 63 of minerals in a sandstone using scanning electron microscopy (SEM) images and 64 Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface area measurements. 65

Regarding the influence of hydraulic heterogeneity, Wen and Li (2017) and Jung and Navarre-Sitchler (2018a) performed reactive transport simulations on stochastically generated permeability fields and studied how hydrologic heterogeneity affects mineral dissolution rates. Using Monte-Carlo simulations, Jung and Navarre-Sitchler (2018b) further studied the time dependency of mineral dissolution rates, and Wen

and Li (2018) developed an upscaled rate law for mineral dissolution in heterogeneous 71 media under variable residence-time and length-scale conditions. R. Li et al. (2020) 72 upscaled mineral dissolution rates in a porous medium with a random permeability 73 field using the fluid travel-time distribution function. The works mentioned above used 74 the transition state theory (Lasaga, 1998) to model mineral dissolution rates, with a 75 macro-scale reaction order of unity (n = 1). This is reasonable since there are no phys-76 ical explanations why this macro-scale reaction order should not be one (Lasaga, 1998; 77 Brantley & Conrad, 2008). 78

79 However, there are rate models with a macro-scale reaction order of 2 in kinetics of crystal growth (Nancollas, 1968; Reddy, 1975, 1977). Such second-order kinetics 80 are used for modeling surface spiral growth (A. E. Nielsen, 1984; Teng et al., 2000). 81 Considering calcite as our mineral of particular interest, fitting experimental data using 82 a reaction order larger than 1 is common, especially when the saturation is close to 83 equilibrium (Plummer & Wigley, 1976; Plummer et al., 1978; Palmer, 1991; Svensson 84 & Dreybrodt, 1992). A higher reaction order is also observed in modeling calcite 85 dissolution in seawater (e.g., Subhas et al., 2015; Naviaux et al., 2019). 86

In this work, we use analytical techniques to develop a constitutive relation of 87 mineral dissolution kinetics in porous media based on models with a reaction order 88 n > 1. We characterize hydraulic heterogeneity and mineral spatial heterogeneity by 89 the longitudinal dispersivity and the reaction order. We use the bundle-of-tubes anal-90 ogy to show how the reaction order relates to both hydraulic and spatial mineral 91 heterogeneity in porous media. Furthermore, we simulate experimental scenarios in-92 volving advective and dispersive transport using such a constitutive relation. Our 93 results show how concentration breakthrough curves of the reactive species reveal in-94 formation of both the hydraulic and chemical heterogeneity of porous media. 95

⁹⁶ 2 Materials and methods

This section first introduces reactive transport models at the pore scale and the 97 Darcy scale. Then we lay out statistical distributions of pore sizes and effective-surface-98 area ratios. Such distributions can thus define the volume-averaged concentration. 99 Constitutive relations based on the Darcy-scale reaction order is established using 100 Taylor series expansions. We check the applicability of the constitutive relations by 101 comparing the modeled concentration and the volume-averaged concentration using a 102 goodness of fit measure, the Jensen Shannon divergence. Finally, we explain how one 103 can apply the proposed constitutive relation using a flow-through experiment. 104

105

2.1 Reactive transport at the pore scale

We use the advection-diffusion-reaction equation to model reactive transport at the pore scale. Consider an elongated pore such that the concentration of the mineralforming solute can be approximated by a one-dimensional (1D) expression:

$$\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial t^*} + u \frac{\partial C^*}{\partial z^*} - D \frac{\partial^2 C^*}{\partial z^{*2}} = q, \qquad (1)$$

where C^* is the solute concentration in the fluid, u is the fluid velocity, D is the molecular diffusivity of the solute, and q is the source term defined by a mineral dissolution model. A common mineral dissolution model is of second order:

$$q = \frac{A}{V_{\rm f}} (k_{\rm d} - k_{\rm p} C^{*2}), \qquad (2)$$

where A is the mineral surface area, $V_{\rm f}$ is the fluid volume, $k_{\rm d}$ is the dissolution rate constant, and $k_{\rm p}$ is the precipitation rate constant. We relate the dissolution model with a more prevalent formulation involving the solubility product, $K_{\rm sp}$, and the ion activity product, IAP:

$$R_{\rm dis} = q \frac{V_{\rm f}}{A} = k_{\rm d} \left(1 - \frac{\rm IAP}{K_{\rm sp}} \right) \,, \tag{3}$$

where $R_{\rm dis}$ is the mineral dissolution rate. One can switch between the two forms by stating IAP = C^2 and $K_{\rm sp} = k_{\rm d}/k_{\rm p}$. The statement, IAP = C^2 means the two mineral-forming ions have equal concentration, which arises from the assumption of electroneutrality of ions close to the mineral surface (Levenson & Emmanuel, 2013). We relate the dimensional and nondimensional quantities by

$$t^* = [t] t, \ z^* = L z, \ C^* = [C] C,$$
(4)

and we nondimensionalize equations (1) and (2) by the following scaling of time and concentration

$$[t] = \frac{L^2}{D}, \quad [C] = \sqrt{\frac{k_{\rm d}}{k_{\rm p}}},\tag{5}$$

where L is a characteristic length. The variables in square brackets refer to characteristic quantities. Thus we have a nondimensional equation of reactive transport

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + Pe \,\frac{\partial C}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} = Da(1 - C^2),\tag{6}$$

$$Pe = \frac{uL}{D}, \quad Da = \frac{A}{V_{\rm f}} \frac{L^2 \sqrt{k_{\rm d} k_{\rm p}}}{D}.$$
(7)

where Pe is the Péclet number and Da is the Damköhler number.

First-order-kinetics models are uncommon, since chemical reactions often involve two reagents (Cussler, 2009). If one wanted to make use of first-order kinetics, one would have to assume the concentration of a mineral-forming ion is in excess or constant (Meile & Tuncay, 2006) or limit the usage of first-order kinetics to low solute concentrations (Kaufmann & Dreybrodt, 2007). Nonetheless, we introduce the model of first-order mineral dissolution kinetics,

$$q = \frac{A}{V_{\rm f}} (k_{\rm d} - k_{\rm p} C^*).$$
 (8)

 $_{132}$ Combining equations (1) and (8), we scale time and concentration by

$$[t] = \frac{L^2}{D}, \quad [C] = \frac{k_{\rm d}}{k_{\rm p}},$$
(9)

133 such that the Péclet and the Damköhler numbers are

$$Pe = \frac{uL}{D}, \quad Da = \frac{A}{V_{\rm f}} \frac{L^2 k_{\rm p}}{D}.$$
 (10)

¹³⁴ The nondimensional model of first-order reactive transport is therefore

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + Pe \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} = Da(1 - C).$$
(11)

¹³⁵ We define the velocity in a pore using the Hagen-Poiseuille equation,

$$u = \frac{r^2}{8} \frac{\Delta P}{\eta L_z},\tag{12}$$

- where r is the pore radius, η is the dynamic viscosity of the fluid, ΔP is the pressure
- $_{137}$ difference between the inlet and the outlet, and L_z is the pore length.

¹³⁸ 2.2 Reactive transport at the Darcy scale

We use the bundle-of-tubes analogy to model reactive transport at the Darcy
 scale (Kozeny, 1927). We define the specific mineral surface area of the porous medium
 as

$$S = \frac{A}{V} = \frac{2L_z \pi \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i r_i}{V},\tag{13}$$

where V is the bulk volume of the porous medium, ω is the ratio between mineral surface area and the total surface area of a pore, and N is the total number of pores. We assume that the pores have the same length, L_z , as the porous medium, such that the tortuosity is 1. The porosity of the porous medium is

$$\phi = \frac{V_{\rm f}}{V} = \frac{L_z \pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^2}{V}.$$
(14)

Dividing equation (13) by equation (14), we obtain

$$\frac{S}{\phi} = \frac{A}{V_{\rm f}} = \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^{N}\omega_i r_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{N}(r_i)^2}.$$
(15)

Recall the Damköhler number for first-order kinetics, equation (10), the Damköhler number at the Darcy scale is

$$Da_{\rm d} = \frac{S}{\phi} \frac{L_z^2 k_{\rm p}}{D},\tag{16}$$

- where the characteristic length, L, is chosen to be the length of the porous medium,
- L_z . The Darcy-scale Damköhler number for second-order kinetics is

$$Da_{\rm d} = \frac{S}{\phi} \frac{L_z^2 \sqrt{k_{\rm d} k_{\rm p}}}{D}.$$
(17)

Since we consider the porous medium as a bundle of tubes, the seepage velocity of theporous medium can be defined using a volume-averaged velocity,

$$\bar{u} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i(r_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^4}{8 \sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^2} \frac{\Delta P}{\mu L_z}.$$
(18)

¹⁵³ Hence, the Péclet number at the Darcy scale is

$$Pe_{\rm d} = \frac{\bar{u}L_z}{D}.\tag{19}$$

¹⁵⁴ Dispersion effects arise when the pore sizes are not uniform (Carbonell, 1979; Arriaza

¹⁵⁵ & Ghezzehei, 2013; Meng & Yang, 2017). Therefore, we introduce a longitudinal ¹⁵⁶ dispersion coefficient,

$$D_{\rm L} = \alpha_{\rm L} \bar{u},\tag{20}$$

where $\alpha_{\rm L}$ is the longitudinal dispersivity with the unit of length. We derived the longitudinal dispersion coefficient using the spatial moments of the averaged solute concentration of the bundle of tubes model,

$$D_{\rm L} = \bar{u}^2 t \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (r_i)^6 \sum_{i=1}^N (r_i)^2}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N (r_i)^4\right)^2} - 1 \right) = \bar{u}^2 t f(r).$$
(21)

The shape factor, f(r), abbreviates the expression of pore sizes in equation (21).

¹⁶¹ Detailed derivations are presented in Appendix A. The longitudinal dispersivity is

$$\alpha_{\rm L} = \bar{u}t f(r) = \bar{z} f(r), \qquad (22)$$

where \bar{z} is the center of mass of an instantaneous source injected in the porous domain. The spatial moment analysis showed that the longitudinal dispersivity increases linearly as the distance traveled of an instantaneous source, which is reasonable in an infinite domain. In recent studies based on pore-network modeling, Mahmoodlu et al. (2020) observed the longitudinal dispersivity increases as travel distance increases.

By scaling the longitudinal dispersion coefficient by the molecular diffusivity yields the nondimensional reactive transport model at the Darcy scale,

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + Pe_{\rm d} \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} - \left(1 + (Pe_{\rm d})^2 t f(r)\right) \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} = q_{\rm d},\tag{23}$$

where q_d is the reaction term that is yet to be defined. Note that when all pores have the same radius and effective-surface-area ratio, equation (23) reduces to the equation for a single pore, equation (6). In the next section, we discuss statistical distributions of pore sizes and effective-surface-area ratios.

173 174

2.3 Statistical distributions of pore sizes and effective-surface-area ratios

The pore sizes of porous media usually follow a log-normal distribution (Shi et al., 1991; Hefny et al., 2020). The probability density function of a log-normally distributed variable, r, is

$$p(r) = \frac{1}{\sigma r \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log (r) - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right),\tag{24}$$

where μ and σ are the mean and standard deviation of the variable's natural logarithm, respectively. The sum of pore sizes raised to the power of m can be described by a raw statistical moment,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^m = \mathbf{E}(r^m) = \int_0^\infty r^m p(r) dr.$$
(25)

If the pore-size distribution is known, the permeability, k, of the bundle can be calculated as

$$k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^4}{8\sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^2} = \frac{\mathbf{E}(r^4)}{8\mathbf{E}(r^2)}.$$
(26)

¹⁸³ Using the moments of the lognormal distribution, we can now clarify the shape factor,

$$f(r) = \exp(4\sigma^2) - 1.$$
 (27)

Since we are interested in not only the pore-size distribution but also the effective surface area of the reactive minerals, we utilize the effective-surface-area ratio, ω , which has a value between zero and one. A convenient choice for modeling the distribution of a variable bounded by zero and one is the beta distribution. The probability density function of the beta distribution is

$$p(\omega) = \frac{\Gamma(a+b)\omega^{a-1}(1-\omega)^{b-1}}{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)},$$
(28)

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function. Variables *a* and *b* shape the beta distribution.

The specific surface area over porosity, S/ϕ , which is a part of the Darcy-scale Damköhler number, equations (16) and (17), can be defined as

$$\frac{S}{\phi} = \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_i r_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (r_i)^2} = \frac{2E(\omega r)}{E(r^2)}.$$
(29)

Such a definition of S/ϕ depends on the pore geometry. Inferring from Hussaini and Dvorkin (2021)'s compilation of specific surface area versus porosity using digital images of natural rocks, S/ϕ can range from 0.15 (Fontainebleau sandstone) to 0.7 (Kentucky sandstone) when $E(\omega) = 1$.

196

202

2.4 A constitutive relation for reaction at the Darcy scale

A constitutive relation is an additional equation that specifies properties of a material. For example, the longitudinal dispersivity describes the dispersion of solute introduced by variations in fluid velocities in a porous material. In this section, we develop a constitutive relation that models the average solute concentration of a porous medium with varying reaction rates in pores.

2.4.1 First-order kinetics

Before we approach the full reactive transport problems – equations (6) and (23) - we start with a single pore involving only mineral dissolution,

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = Da(1-C), \quad C(t=0) = C_0, \tag{30}$$

where C_0 is the initial concentration of the mineral-forming solute in the pore. We consider an aspect ratio, r/L_z , small enough such that a volume-averaged concentration is representative. Using equation (10), the Damköhler number in a cylindrical pore is

$$Da = \frac{2\omega}{r} \frac{L_z^2 k_{\rm p}}{D},\tag{31}$$

where $2\omega/r$ defines the pore-scale geometry and $L_z^2 k_p/D$ defines the physics of the problem. In this work, we focus on analyzing how pore-scale geometry affects solute concentration and reaction rate over time and assume $L_z^2 k_p/D$ constant. We abbreviate $L_z^2 k_p/D$ to Da_p . The solution for the single-pore reaction problem is

$$C(t; \omega, r) = (C_0 - 1)e^{(-2 Da_p \omega/r)t} + 1.$$
(32)

213 We define the volume-averaged solution as

$$C_{\text{avg}}(t) = \frac{\int_0^1 \int_0^\infty C(t; \,\omega, r) p(\omega, r) r^2 dr d\omega}{\int_0^\infty p(r) r^2 dr}$$
(33)

$$= (C_0 - 1) \frac{\int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} e^{(-2 D a_p \omega/r)t} p(\omega, r) r^2 dr d\omega}{\int_0^{\infty} p(r) r^2 dr} + 1.$$
(34)

The bounds of the integral over the pore size, r, should correspond to the bounds of the

prescribed pore-size distribution. Consider $C_0 = 0$ and expand the volume-averaged solution using a Taylor series around t = 0:

$$C_{\rm avg}(t) = -\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{k!} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{-2 D a_{\rm p} \,\omega t}{r} \right)^k p(\omega, r) r^2 dr d\omega \right) / \mathcal{E}(r^2) + 1 \tag{35}$$

$$= -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(-2 D a_{\mathrm{p}} t)^k}{k!} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty p(\omega, r) \omega^k r^{2-k} dr d\omega \right) / \mathcal{E}(r^2)$$
(36)

$$= -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(-2 D a_{\rm p} t)^k}{k!} \frac{{\rm E}(\omega^k r^{2-k})}{{\rm E}(r^2)} \right)$$
(37)

$$= 2 D a_{\rm p} t \frac{{\rm E}(\omega r)}{{\rm E}(r^2)} - 2(D a_{\rm p} t)^2 \frac{{\rm E}(\omega^2)}{{\rm E}(r^2)} + O(t^3).$$
(38)

Let us now describe the Darcy-scale reaction in the same manner as we did for a single pore, equation (30). In this case, the definition of the Darcy-scale Damköhler number,

$$Da_{\rm d} = 2 Da_{\rm p} \frac{\mathcal{E}(\omega r)}{\mathcal{E}(r^2)},\tag{39}$$

leads to a first-order approximation of the volume-averaged concentration. To better approximate C_{avg} , we propose a nonlinear reaction-rate model as a constitutive relation,

$$\frac{d\overline{C}}{dt} = Da_{\rm d}(1-\overline{C})^n, \quad \overline{C}(t=0) = C_0, \tag{40}$$

where n is the reaction order (Lasaga, 1998). Many researchers have attempted to explain values for the reaction order in terms of dissolution or precipitation processes (e.g., Blum & Lasaga, 1987; Teng et al., 2000). However, attributions of a process on the basis of the value of this exponent is generally not defensible without further observations (Brantley, 2008). For further discussion, see Brantley (2003, 2008).

The solution to the nonlinear reaction-rate model, equation (40), is

$$\overline{C}(t) = 1 - \left[Da_{\rm d}(n-1)t + (1-C_0)^{1-n} \right]^{1/(1-n)}.$$
(41)

Its Taylor series expansion around t = 0 while $C_0 = 0$ is

$$\overline{C}(t) = 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} (j(n-1)+1)}{k!} (-Da_{\rm d} t)^k$$
(42)

$$= Da_{\rm d} t - \frac{n}{2} (Da_{\rm d} t)^2 + \frac{n(2n-1)}{6} (Da_{\rm d} t)^3 + O(t^4).$$
(43)

We observe that the Darcy-scale Damköhler number, equation (39), still matches the

first-order term of the volume-averaged solution, equation (38). If we define

$$n = \frac{\mathcal{E}(\omega^2)\mathcal{E}(r^2)}{\mathcal{E}^2(\omega r)},\tag{44}$$

then the nonlinear reaction-rate model approximates the volume-averaged concentration to the second order with respect to time. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we infer $n \ge 1$, which agrees with experimental observations. The inverse square root of this definition of the reaction order, n, is also known as Tucker's congruence coefficient, which assesses similarity between two variables (Lorenzo-Seva & ten Berge, 2006).

Figure 1 shows scatter plots of pore sizes and effective-surface-area ratios. Each 236 point represents an observation of the pore size and the effective-surface-area ratio in 237 a porous sample. Tucker's congruence coefficient, r_c , measures the similarity between 238 pore size and effective-surface-area ratio. From the leftmost figure to the rightmost 239 figure, the congruence coefficient decreases as the observations become less similar, 240 or more heterogeneous. Since the reaction order, n, is the squared inverse of the 241 congruence coefficient, the reaction order increases as the heterogeneity increases. Such 242 a definition of the reaction order is a function of the geometric variables ω and r. Thus 243 we can use the reaction order to infer pore-scale spatial heterogeneity of minerals. 244

245 2.4.2 Second-order kinetics

246

227

We model the single-pore problem with second-order kinetics by

 $\frac{dC}{dt} = Da(1 - C^2), \quad C(t = 0) = 0, \tag{45}$

where the solution is

$$C = \tanh\left(Da \cdot t\right),\tag{46}$$



Figure 1. This figure shows scatter plots of pore sizes and effective-surface-area ratio. The title of each plot shows the reaction order, n, and Tucker's congruence coefficient, r_c .

which is an odd function. Using equation (7), the Damköhler number in a cylindrical pore is

$$Da = \frac{2\omega}{r} \frac{L_z^2 \sqrt{k_d k_p}}{D},\tag{47}$$

where $L_z^2 \sqrt{k_{\rm d}k_{\rm p}}/D$, which we abbreviate to $Da_{\rm p}$, defines the physics of the problem for second-order kinetics. The volume-averaged concentration is defined using equation (33), and we apply a Taylor series expansion to the volume-averaged concentration,

$$C_{\rm avg}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{B_{2k} 4^k (4^k - 1)}{(2k)!} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{2 D a_{\rm p} \, \omega t}{r} \right)^{2k-1} p(\omega, r) r^2 dr d\omega \right) / \mathcal{E}(r^2) \tag{48}$$

$$=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{B_{2k} 4^k (4^k - 1)(2 D a_p t)^{2k-1}}{(2k)!} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty p(\omega, r) \omega^{2k-1} r^{3-2k} dr d\omega \right) / \mathcal{E}(r^2)$$
(49)

$$= 2 D a_{\rm p} t \frac{{\rm E}(\omega r)}{{\rm E}(r^2)} - \frac{(2 D a_{\rm p} t)^3}{3} \frac{{\rm E}(\omega^3 r^{-1})}{{\rm E}(r^2)} + O((D a_{\rm p} t)^5),$$
(50)

where B_{2k} is the Bernoulli number (Oldham et al., 2009). The Taylor series expansion of the hyperbolic tangent function, equation (46), converges for $Dat < \pi/2$, which is not of concern since we utilize only the derivatives of $C_{\text{avg}}(t = 0)$.

We propose the following constitutive relation that describes the solute concentration at the Darcy scale,

$$\frac{d\overline{C}}{dt} = Da_{\rm d}(1 - \overline{C}^2)^n, \quad \overline{C}(t=0) = 0.$$
(51)

We do not attempt to find a solution for \overline{C} . However, we can still expand \overline{C} around t = 0 with a Taylor series:

$$\overline{C} = Da_{\rm d} t - \frac{n(n+1)}{6} (Da_{\rm d} t)^3 + O(t^4),$$
(52)

which is also an odd function. See Appendix B for detailed derivations. Comparing the third-order term of equation (50) with that of equation (52) yields

$$\frac{n(n+1)}{2} = \frac{\mathcal{E}(\omega^3 r^{-1}) \mathcal{E}^2(r^2)}{\mathcal{E}^3(\omega r)}.$$
(53)

263 One can utilize the quadratic formula to explicitly determine n,

$$n = \left(-1 + \sqrt{1 + 8\mathrm{E}(\omega^3 r^{-1})\mathrm{E}^2(r^2)/\mathrm{E}^3(\omega r)}\right)/2,\tag{54}$$

where we consider only the larger value of n as a solution. Note that the reaction

²⁶⁵ orders for first- and second-order kinetics are non-dimensional and, most importantly,

independent of the length scale and the reaction rate constants.

267 2.5 Goodness of fit between the pore-scale and the Darcy-scale concen-268 trations

There exists a variety of goodness-of-fit measures between models and experi-269 mental observations. For example, the coefficient of determination, R^2 , is often used 270 to determine the kinetic rate law when applying the integral method (Brantley & Con-271 rad, 2008; Zhao & Skelton, 2014). The mean-squared error is also a goodness-of-fit 272 measure, and the least-squares approach tends to minimize such a metric. We use an-273 other goodness-of-fit measure, the Jensen-Shannon divergence, which is based on the 274 275 Kullback-Leibler divergence (Kullback & Leibler, 1951). The Kullback-Leibler divergence between some unknown distribution, p(x), and an approximating distribution, 276 q(x), is: 277

$$\mathrm{KL}(p||q) = \int p(x) \log_2\left(\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}\right) dx.$$
(55)

The Kullback-Leibler divergence satisifies $\operatorname{KL}(p||q) \geq 0$ with equality if, and only if, p(x) = q(x) (Bishop, 2006). Although $\operatorname{KL}(p||q) \geq 0$, it may diverge to infinity depending on the underlying densities (F. Nielsen, 2020). Thus we use the Jensen-Shannon divergence,

$$JS(p||q) = \frac{1}{2} \left(KL\left(p||\frac{p+q}{2}\right) + KL\left(q||\frac{p+q}{2}\right) \right)$$
(56)

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int \left(p(x) \log_2 \left(\frac{2p(x)}{p(x) + q(x)} \right) + q(x) \log_2 \left(\frac{2q(x)}{p(x) + q(x)} \right) \right) dx, \tag{57}$$

which is bounded between 0 and 1 when using base-2 logarithms (Lin, 1991). Throughout this work, we use the Jensen-Shannon distance, which is defined as the square root of the Jensen-Shannon divergence.

Such a metric measures the distance between probability distributions (Endres & Schindelin, 2003; Österreicher & Vajda, 2003; Levene & Kononovicius, 2019). The following describes how we apply this measure to solute concentration over time, $C_{avg}(t)$ and $\overline{C}(t)$. Suppose we regard solute concentration over time as cumulative distribution functions. In that case, we measure the Jensen-Shannon divergence of their derivatives, which can be seen as the probability density functions or the reaction rates over time.

When the observed solute concentration is not monotonically increasing over time like a cumulative distribution function, we simply use the root-mean-square error (RMSE) as a quality measure of the constitutive relation,

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{\int (p(x) - q(x))^2 dx}{\max(x) - \min(x)}}.$$
(58)

295 296

2.6 Determination of the Darcy-scale Damköhler number, Da_d , and the reaction order, n, using power series

²⁹⁷ We test the constitutive relation using the volume-averaged concentration, $C_{\text{avg}}(t)$, ²⁹⁸ which is an analogy of solute concentration measurements from a dissolution experi-²⁹⁹ ment. Assume the solute concentration can be described by the constitutive relation ³⁰⁰ within a certain error. Then we can use the Taylor series expansions, equations (43) ³⁰¹ and (52), to obtain the Darcy-scale Damköhler number,

$$Da_{\rm d} = C'_{\rm avg}(t=0),$$
 (59)

which is the initial rate of reaction. When the kinetics is of first order, the reaction order is obtained by differentiating equation (43) twice,

$$n = -\frac{C''_{\rm avg}(t=0)}{(Da_{\rm d})^2}.$$
(60)

Differentiating equation (52) thrice and rearranging yields the reaction order for secondorder kinetics,

$$n(n+1) = -\frac{C_{\text{avg}}^{'''}(t=0)}{(Da_{\text{d}})^3}.$$
(61)

This method of determining Da_d and n utilizes power-series expansion and requires only the derivatives of the solute concentration at t = 0.

We consider three sets of log-normally distributed pore sizes, R_1 , R_2 , and R_3 , which have $S/\phi \approx 0.6$ but different variances. The pore sizes are chosen such that they range from 10–80 μ m (Gong et al., 2020). Likewise, we assume the effective surface area follows the beta distribution, where Ω_1 considers most pores fully reactive, Ω_2 assumes a larger variance of mineral surface area in the pores, and Ω_3 implies that the reactive mineral constitutes a small portion of the porous sample. Figure 2 shows the details of the aforementioned probability distributions.

The products of the random variables R and Ω form nine scenarios of the bundle-315 of-tubes model, which can be used as benchmarks for our power-series approach to 316 obtain the Darcy-scale Damköhler number and the reaction order. We compare this 317 method with a goodness-of-fit minimization using both Da_{d} and n as unknowns, sim-318 ilar to the ideas of nonlinear least-squares model fitting (Fogler, 2016). Initially, the 319 pores are filled with dissolving fluid with no solute concentration, C = 0. Then the 320 mineral starts to dissolve into the fluid, such that the solute concentration increases. 321 We assume we can observe the average concentration, C_{avg} , without transport effects. 322 To capture the full reaction behavior, the simulation ends when the solute concentra-323 tion, C_{avg} , is larger than 0.99. The physics related parameters, Da_{p} , is set as 50, such 324 that the Darcy-scale Damköhler numbers of the scenarios are at a similar scale.



Figure 2. This figure shows the probability density functions of the distribution of pore sizes and effective-surface-area ratio. The legends state the essential parameters for generating the probability density functions.

325

326

2.7 Flow-through experiment

In the previous section, we test the constitutive relation considering only mineral reaction. To measure the solute concentration of the fluid in a porous sample, one has

to push the fluid out of the porous sample. We now discuss this full reactive transport 329 problem. Consider a flow-through experiment, i.e., injecting fluid that dissolves the 330 mineral in a porous sample. We collect the fluid from the outlet and measure the solute 331 concentration over time. Before the experiment, the porous sample should be saturated 332 by the dissolving fluid. After a certain amount of time, the fluid has accumulated an 333 initial solute concentration. Then we start the flow-through experiment by injecting 334 fluid without solute under high Péclet number. We take fluid samples from the outlet 335 and measure the solute concentration. Since we are injecting fluid with zero solute 336 concentration, we expect the measured solute concentration at the outlet to decrease 337 over time. When the outlet concentration is close to zero, we reduce the Péclet number 338 to 0.1-1% of the original Péclet number in order to observe an increase of the outlet 339 solute concentration. This process creates a V-shaped curve of outlet concentration 340 over time. 341

We use FEniCS (Alnaes et al., 2015) to solve the transient initial boundary value problem of each pore and apply equation (33) to obtain the average concentration. Details of the numerical methods are explained in Appendix C. We assume the porous sample can be described by a combination of the pore-size distribution, R_1 , and the effective-surface-area ratio, Ω_3 . In the following subsections, we discuss two cases of low and high Damköhler numbers. In both cases, we consider the molecular diffusivity, D, as $5 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$.

2.7.1 The low Damköhler-number case, $Da_d = 0.1$

349

The Darcy-scale Damköhler number, equation (39), is proportional to the length scale squared. This case is suitable when the mineral has low reaction rates or when the porous domain is short (small length scale), e.g., a 5 cm rock sample in a laboratory. We consider this our "small length-scale scenario" for which the outlet solute concentration can be measured. Since the Damköhler number is low, the solute concentration during injection of the dissolving fluid should be far from chemical equilibrium. Therefore, we assume the reaction is of first order.

Following the procedure of the flow-through experiment, we set the initial Péclet number as 10 and the Darcy-scale Damköhler number is 0.1. We reduce the Péclet number to 0.01 at 0.15 nondimensional time. The simulation ends at 1.5 nondimensional time, which for the 5 cm rock sample mentioned above would correspond to about 8.7 days.

The solute concentration over time at the outlet of the porous sample is collected from the simulation data. Knowing the Péclet number and that the mineral reaction is of first order, we fit the observed concentration over time with the reactive transport model,

$$\frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial t} + Pe_{\rm d} \frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial z} - \left(1 + (Pe_{\rm d})^2 t f(r)\right) \frac{\partial^2 \overline{C}}{\partial z^2} = Da_{\rm d} (1 - \overline{C})^n.$$
(62)

The shape factor, f(r), is defined using equation (21). Utilizing the optimization procedures in SciPy (Virtanen et al., 2020), we find Da_d and n by minimizing the RMSE between the observation and the model.

Another method of fitting Da_d and n is to utilize a part of $C_{avg}(t)$, where the diffusion effects are dominant enough ($Pe \ll 1$) such that we can treat the concentration as constant over space. Owing to the divergence theorem and the boundary condition C(0,t) = 0, results in

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + Pe_{\rm d}\,\overline{C}(1,t) = Da_{\rm d}(1-\overline{C})^n. \tag{63}$$

Then, we can perform least-squares fitting on the left-hand side to determine Da_d and n. Figure 3 shows the outlet concentration of the flow-through experiment and highlights the region in which we consider diffusion to be dominant. Such an approach relies heavily on the strong-diffusion assumption, and is therefore not suitable for the high Damköhler-number case, discussed in the next section.



Figure 3. The outlet concentration over time of the low Damköhler-number problem. The orange line shows the part, where we apply the least-squares fitting technique (equation (63)). The vertical dashed line indicates the time, t = 0.15, when the injection rate is reduced.

2.7.2 The high Damköhler-number case, $Da_{\rm d} = 4 \times 10^4$

Consider a field experiment in an aquifer, where the length scale is on the order of meters. Here, a fluid is injected in one well and produced at another well. In this case, it may not be possible to observe a concentration breakthrough at the outlet. Thus, we perform simulations of a flow-through experiment and measure the solute concentration at the inlet over time. The Darcy-scale Damköhler number is 4×10^4 . We assume a second-order kinetics model for the mineral reaction, and our reactive transport model is

$$\frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial t} + Pe_{\rm d} \frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial z} - \left(1 + (Pe_{\rm d})^2 t f(r)\right) \frac{\partial^2 \overline{C}}{\partial z^2} = Da_{\rm d} (1 - \overline{C}^2)^n.$$
(64)

We consider three cases of initial Péclet numbers, 4×10^3 , 8×10^3 , and 8×10^4 . The injection stops at 2×10^{-6} dimensionless time, and the simulation ends at 1×10^{-5} dimensionless time, which is roughly 231.5 days considering a 100 m simulation domain.

Though it is practically not possible to observe the inlet concentration during the injection phase, we perform the fitting of Da_d , n, and f(r) using all information of C_{avg} at the inlet. In the latter phase when injection stops (rising limb of the curve in Figure 3), it should be possible to determine the concentration at the inlet by sampling the fluid in the injection well.

394 **3 Results**

378

In this section, we show the benchmarks of the power-series approach and the simulations of flow-through experiments. Then, we discuss the results in section 4.

397 **3.1** Benchmark of the power-series approach

We benchmark the power-series approach that obtains the reaction order, n, and the Darcy-scale Damköhler number, Da_d , using a bundle of tubes characterized by the distributions of pore sizes and effective-surface-area ratio described in Section 2.6.

Figures 4 and 5 show the benchmark for the first-order kinetics and the secondorder kinetics, respectively. In the upper part of the figures, we plot the contour lines of log-scaled Jensen Shannon divergence between C_{avg} and \overline{C} . The red points indicate the approximation of Da_{d} and n using the power-series approach. In an ideal case, the red points should be in the minimum of the Jensen Shannon divergence. In the lower part of the figures, we plot the concentration over time of the scenarios that performed the worst.



Figure 4. The upper part of the figure shows the contours of the log-scaled Jensen Shannon divergence between the observed concentration and the modeled concentration of first-order kinetics using the constitutive relation. The red points are the Darcy-scale Damköhler number and the reaction order approximated by the power-series approach (equations (59) and (60)). The legend shows the value of the log-scaled Jenson Shannon divergence using a gray scale, corresponding to the brightness of the colored contour lines. The lower part of the figure shows the concentrations over time C_{avg} and \overline{C} of the scenarios $R_1\Omega_3$, $R_3\Omega_3$, and $R_3\Omega_2$.

3.2 Flow-through experiment

408

Figure 6 shows the observed concentration, C_{avg} , and the modeled concentration, \overline{C} . Table 1 shows the Darcy-scale Damköhler number, the reaction order, and shape factor obtained by direct calculation (equations (39), (44) and (54)) and by RMSE minimization of the low and high Damköhler-number cases ($Da_d = 0.1$ and $Da_d =$ 413 40 000, respectively) and corresponding to the $R_1\Omega_3$ distribution. The results of the least-squares curve fitting method, used only in the low Damköhler-number scenario, 415 are $Da_d = 0.1$ and n = 1.38.



Figure 5. The upper part of the figure shows the contours of the log-scaled Jensen Shannon divergence between the observed concentration and the modeled concentration of second-order kinetics using the constitutive relation. The red points are the Darcy-scale Damköhler number and the reaction order approximated by the power series approach (equations (59) and (61)). The legend shows the value of the log-scaled Jenson Shannon divergence using a gray scale, corresponding to the brightness of the colored contour lines. The lower part of the figure shows the concentrations over time C_{avg} and \overline{C} of the scenarios $R_2\Omega_3$, $R_3\Omega_3$, and $R_3\Omega_2$, respectively.



Figure 6. The figures show the concentration C_{avg} (solid lines) and the modeled concentration \overline{C} (dashed lines) of the low and high Damköhler-number cases on the left and right panels, respectively. The top panel shows the cases with fitting Da_d and n. The bottom panel shows the cases with fitting Da_d , n, and the shape factor, f(r), additionally.

Table 1. This table summarizes the Darcy-scale Damköhler number, Da_d , the reaction order, n, and the shape factor, f(r), obtained by fitting the concentration-over-time curve using the constitutive relation with the RMSE metric. The values of the direct calculation are the result of prescribing Da_p and the $R_1\Omega_3$ distribution. In the low Da_d case, we assumed first-order kinetics. Hence we use equation (44) to calculate the reaction order. We assumed second-order kinetics for the high Da case, and equation (54) is used for calculating the reaction order for second-order kinetics.

Initial $Pe_{\rm d}$	10	4 000	8 000	40 000
		Direct c	alculation	
$Da_{\rm d}$	0.1		40000	
n	1.40		1.77	
f(r)		4.081	$\times 10^{-2}$	
		Minimu	m RMSE	
Dad	0.1	52 528	45154	38464
n	1.57	1.57	1.66	1.30
	Mini	mum RMSE wit	th shape factor	fitting
$Da_{\rm d}$	0.1	50 887	42049	38950
n	1.68	1.55	1.59	1.53
f(r)	2.39×10^{-2}	1.402×10^{-1}	1.222×10^{-1}	3.168×10^{-2}

416 4 Discussion

417

4.1 Benchmark of the power-series approach

In Figure 4, we observed that the power-series approach obtains Da_d and n close to the minimum Jensen Shannon distance. The connections between nonlinear fitting of the parameters, Da_d and n, and the geometric information of the porous medium are established since the power-series approach is exact for retrieving expected values of the pore-size and the effective-surface-area distributions.

In Figure 5, we observed general agreement of Da_d and n obtained by the power-423 series approach to those at the minimum Jensen Shannon distance. As the variance of 424 the pore-size increases, the obtained $Da_{\rm d}$ and n (red points) stray from the minimum 425 Jensen Shannon distance. In the selected concentration plots, the modeled concen-426 tration fits well when $\overline{C} < 0.5$. Some discrepancy between \overline{C} and C_{avg} is present 427 when $\overline{C} > 0.5$. Comparing to the results of first-order kinetics, where \overline{C} fits C_{avg} well 428 throughout all concentrations, our averaged model of second-order kinetics can only 429 fit reactions far from equilibrium (e.g., C < 0.5). 430

431

The power-series approach of obtaining Da_d and n suffers from the fact that:

- ⁴³² 1. reaction rates at zero concentration can be hard to obtain, and
- 433 2. numerical differentiation of higher-order derivatives can yield spurious results.

Therefore, we require other nonlinear fitting methods by minimizing the divergence between models and observations. In the next section, we discuss the intricacies of nonlinear fitting of solute concentration during flow-through experiments.

437 4.2 Flow-through experiment

The top-left panel of Figure 6 shows the low Damköhler-number, first-order-438 reaction case, where both the RMSE minimization and the least-squares fitting method 439 fits the outlet concentration, C_{avg} . Both methods of obtaining Da_{d} and n are accu-440 rate within 15% relative error as confirmed by direct calculation from pore-size and 441 effective-surface-area distributions. The good agreement can be attributed to the fact 442 that the solute can be mostly flushed out from the porous domain, due to the low 443 Damköhler number. Hence, the solute concentration in each tube goes down to almost 444 445 zero, and spatial gradients of the solute concentration in the z direction are negligible. This creates a situation similar to the problem considering only reaction effects, which 446 is not the case for the scenarios of high Damköhler-number, second-order kinetics. 447

Focusing on the high Damköhler-number scenarios, we observe general agreement 448 of fitted parameters. For the case of initial $Pe_{\rm d} = 4\,000$, the error in $Da_{\rm d}$ can be 449 attributed to the fact that the volume injected is not enough, such that the dissolution 450 in smaller pores is not observed in C_{avg} . The case of initial $Pe_{\text{d}} = 8\,000$ approximated 451 $Da_{\rm d}$ closer to the prescribed value than the previous case. The third case of initial 452 $Pe_{\rm d} = 40\,000$, performed the best in retrieving $Da_{\rm d}$. This may be because this case is 453 similar to the low Damköhler-number case, in which the initial solute concentration of 454 all pores is pushed out from the porous domain, such that C_{avg} is close to zero. The 455 purpose of comparing these three cases is to emphasize that the inversion of parameters 456 is influenced by how we perform the injection test, namely, by the selection of the initial 457 Péclet number. 458

Furthermore, we performed a fitting in all cases considering the shape factor as unknown. The bottom panels of Figure 6 show the cases where we fit the shape factor, f(r), in addition to Da_d and n. For the low Damköhler number case, we have a good fit of f(r) within an order of magnitude. However, the obtained value for n exhibits a bigger error. This signals the vagueness of the reaction order and the shape factor in minimizing RMSE, where increasing or decreasing either one of the variables leads to similar RMSE.

For the high Damköhler number cases, the obtained $Da_{\rm d}$ improved slightly com-466 paring to the cases with a prescribed shape factor. All fitted shape factors are within 467 an order of magnitude compared to the theoretical calculations. In particular, for 468 the case of initial $Pe_{\rm d} = 40\,000$, we observe a good fit of the retrieved shape factor. 469 Although imperfect, our method of parameter estimation using a solute concentration 470 breakthrough curve is useful for modeling the average behavior of reactive transport 471 in porous media. The results suggest that it is possible to infer pore-scale information 472 using the inversion of averaged parameters. 473

Figure 7 shows the concentration in pores, the averaged concentration, and the 474 modeled concentration of the high Damköhler number, initial $Pe_{\rm d} = 40\,000$ scenario. 475 When the injection stops, the increase of the inlet solute concentration is not only due 476 to the reaction, but also due to the diffusion of solute from the reservoir to the inlet. 477 We attribute the underestimated n to our reactive transport model, equation (64), 478 not being able to capture the diffusion effects in each pore, which results in a lower 479 reaction order. Certainly, this situation is not as ideal as the low Damköhler-number 480 situation. Though, the modeled concentration, \overline{C} , still represents the average behavior 481 of the pore concentrations. 482

In all of the flow-through experiments, we considered only one observation point,
either the fluid inlet or the fluid outlet. This work serves as a demonstration of the
base case with only one observation. To improve the fitting of the reaction order of the
high Damköhler-number cases, one can incorporate more observation points, spatially
distributed within the domain.



Figure 7. This figure shows the solute concentration in the pores, C, the averaged concentration, C_{avg} , and the modeled concentration, \overline{C} , of the initial $Pe_{\text{d}} = 40\,000$ scenario without shape factor fitting. The left panel shows the solute concentration in the porous domain during fluid injection. The right panel shows the solute concentration after fluid injection has stopped, as indicated by the increasing fluid inlet concentration.

4.3 The applicability of the constitutive relations

488

By adding an exponent to the pore-scale reaction model, the Darcy-scale reaction model effectively describes the averaged behavior of reactions taking place independently in different pores of the porous medium. We examine the applicability of the simple approach using the averaged concentration of first-order kinetics as an example. The averaged concentration, equation (34), can be considered as a continuous mixture of exponential distributions,

$$C_{\rm avg}(t) = 1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} p(\lambda) d\lambda, \qquad (65)$$

where λ is a parameter that characterizes the exponential distributions. The finite mixture is known as the hyperexponential distribution, which is utilized for fitting long-tail distributions (Feldmann & Whitt, 1998; Okada et al., 2020). If λ is a gamma distribution, then $C_{\text{avg}}(t)$ is a Pareto distribution (Balakrishna & Lai, 2009). The concentration of our proposed model, equation (41), has the following form when $C_0 = 0$:

$$\overline{C}(t) = 1 - [1 + Da_{\rm d}(n-1)t]^{1/(1-n)}, \qquad (66)$$

which is the cumulative distribution function of the Pareto distribution, also called the Lomax distribution. There exists a particular ratio distribution of the effective surface area and the pore sizes, Ω/R , that satisfies $\overline{C} = C_{\text{avg}}$. Such an existence contributes to the effectiveness of the constitutive relation for the first-order kinetics.

In contrast, the theoretical basis of constitutive relations for second-order kinetics is less distinct. We simply followed the derivations of first-order kinetics and exploited the oddity of C_{avg} and \overline{C} to obtain a second-order approximation. The solution for second-order kinetics in a single pore, equation (46), can be recast to

$$C = \tanh(Da \cdot t) = \frac{1 - e^{-2 Da \cdot t}}{1 + e^{-2 Da \cdot t}},$$
(67)

which is a cumulative distribution function of a scaled logistic distribution. If we consider time a semi-infinite domain $[0, \infty)$, such a distribution is also known as the half logistic distribution (Balakrishnan, 1985). Though we did not find or derive the relationships of the logistic distribution mixture, we denote the possibility of approximating such a mixture using the Pareto distribution, equation (66), since the hyperbolic tangent function can be represented by a Laurent series,

$$\tanh\left(t\right) = 1 - 2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{k} e^{-2t(k+1)}, \ t > 0, \tag{68}$$

which is a mixture of exponential distributions. Such expansion techniques would avoid relying on derivatives around C = 0 as is done in this study, which may be advantageous but requires more research.

4.4 Limitations and outlook

518

The main limitation of this study is that the reaction model we considered is simple and may not be adequate to describe complex geochemical processes, e.g., a rock sample which consists of multiple dissolving minerals. Though we considered two common models of first- and second-order kinetics, we treat the rate constant, k_d and k_p , as constant and, indeed, k_d and k_p may change as temperature, pH, or ionic strength changes.

Moreover, the assumption that chemical reactions in each tube occur indepen-525 dently of the other tubes is idealized. In pore-network modeling, the porous medium is 526 discretized as a network of pore bodies and pore throats, and the coordination number 527 is defined as number of connections to each pore body. Experimental studies have 528 reported that the average coordination number of a sandstone is ~ 4 (e.g., Ioannidis 529 & Chatzis, 2000; Øren & Bakke, 2003; Hefny et al., 2020). Our bundle-of-tubes model 530 has an average coordination number of 0 (or 1, if one considers the pores reside at the 531 fluid inlet and outlet boundaries), which is the base case for pore-network modeling. 532 For this base case, the reaction order does not depend on Pe_{d} or Da_{d} . The dependence 533 of the reaction order on Pe_{d} or Da_{d} for larger coordination numbers requires further 534 studies. 535

Nonetheless, our simple model reveals a possible mechanistic explanation to the
 usage of the Darcy-scale reaction order larger than one, and how it can reveal geometric
 information of the porous medium using the solute breakthrough curve. We suggest
 considerations of the aforementioned limitations as potential topics for future research.

We propose another possible application of this work in view of energy conservation in a porous sample, where there is only one definition of temperature of the fluid, $T_{\rm f}^*$, and the porous solid, $T_{\rm s}^*$. A special case of energy conservation without pressure work and viscous heating is analogous to equation (1):

$$\frac{\partial T_{\rm f}^*}{\partial t^*} + u \frac{\partial T_{\rm f}^*}{\partial z^*} - D_{\rm f} \frac{\partial^2 T_{\rm f}^*}{\partial z^{*2}} = q_T, \tag{69}$$

where $D_{\rm f}$ is the thermal diffusivity of the fluid and q_T is a heat source introduced by the porous solid. Usually, such an energy conservation model of heat tracer tests assumes thermal equilibrium between the fluid and the porous solid, $T_{\rm f} = T_{\rm s}$, (Shook, 2001; Anderson, 2005; Saar, 2011). However, studies and modeling on thermal disequilibrium between fluid and solid phases have gained interest lately (Karani & Huber, 2017; Koch et al., 2021). If we consider a heat tracer test, where we create a breakthrough curve like the ones in Figure 3, we can model the behavior by

$$\frac{\partial T_{\rm f}^*}{\partial t^*} + u \frac{\partial T_{\rm f}^*}{\partial z^*} - D_{\rm f} \frac{\partial^2 T_{\rm f}^*}{\partial z^{*2}} = \frac{\overline{D}A}{V_{\rm f}} \frac{(T_{\rm s}^* - T_{\rm f}^*)}{L^*},\tag{70}$$

where \overline{D} is a certain average of the thermal diffusivity of the porous medium, and L^* is a characteristic length that defines the heat flux between the solid-fluid boundary. The formulation is similar to our study of reactive transport with first-order kinetics. Therefore, it is possible to apply the same techniques described in this work to obtain the "reaction order" and infer pore-scale information.

549 5 Conclusion

Mineral reaction kinetics defined at the pore scale are not necessarily valid at the 550 Darcy scale. We utilize a bundle-of-tubes model to study the modeling of dissolution 551 kinetics in porous media at the Darcy scale. By adding an exponent, n (i.e. the Darcy-552 scale reaction order), to first- and second-order kinetics, the resulting constitutive 553 relation approximates the average dissolution rate of the bundle-of-tubes model. Using 554 the pore-size and the effective-surface-area ratio distributions to characterize the tube 555 bundles, we expand the solute concentration of dissolving species with Taylor series 556 and thus relate the Darcy-scale Damköhler number, Da_{d} , and reaction order with 557 the distribution moments. The Taylor-series expansions show that the Darcy-scale 558 reaction order of first-order kinetics is the inverse square root of Tucker's congruence 559 coefficient (also known as the cosine similarity) between the pore sizes and effective-560 surface-area ratios. Therefore, an increase of reaction order indicates an increase of 561 pore-scale heterogeneity. Such a relation gives a mechanistic meaning to the reaction 562 order. 563

Furthermore, we simulate flow-through experiments of dissolving porous media 564 at the laboratory as well as the field scale and discuss how one can utilize the consti-565 tutive relation by fitting a solute concentration breakthrough curve with $Da_{\rm d}$ and n 566 as unknowns. As an additional benefit, we discuss cases of the flow-through experi-567 ments where the shape factor of longitudinal dispersivity is also considered as a fitting 568 parameter. The inversion is successful, and the fitted parameters are close to the pre-569 scribed parameters calculated by the moments of pore-size and effective-surface-area 570 ratio distributions. We infer that: 571

- 5721. detailed pore-scale information (characterized by functions of moments) can be
inferred using averaged Darcy-scale quantities (such as solute concentration),
and574and
- by analyzing the solute concentration of dissolving minerals over time using
 flow-through experiments, we can acquire the Darcy-scale reaction order and
 the dispersion coefficient, which represent heterogeneity at the pore scale.
- The relations we derived provide us a quantitative approach to measure the spatial heterogeneity of a porous domain using the Darcy-scale reaction order and reveal a mechanistic explanation for n > 1.

Appendix A Derivation of the longitudinal dispersivity using spatial moment analysis

We introduce an advection equation of solute concentration in a pore

$$\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial t^*} + u \frac{\partial C^*}{\partial z^*} = 0. \tag{A1}$$

The velocity, u, is defined using equation (12)

583

$$\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial t^*} + \frac{r^2}{8} \frac{\Delta P}{\mu L_z} \frac{\partial C^*}{\partial z^*} = 0. \tag{A2}$$

When injecting a solute pulse at x = 0, the center of mass of the solute is located at

$$z^{*}(t^{*};r) = r^{2} \frac{\Delta P}{8\mu L_{z}} t^{*}.$$
 (A3)

- ⁵⁸⁶ Similar to the volume averaging procedure, Eq. (33), we define the center of mass in
- a bundle of tubes system

$$\bar{z}^{*}(t^{*}) = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} z^{*}(t^{*};r)r^{2}p(r)dr}{\int_{0}^{\infty} r^{2}p(r)dr} = \frac{\mathrm{E}(r^{4})}{\mathrm{E}(r^{2})}\frac{\Delta P}{8\mu L_{z}}t^{*}.$$
(A4)

- Following the procedures of spatial moment analysis (Goltz & Roberts, 1987; Dentz
- ⁵⁸⁹ & de Barros, 2013; Lee et al., 2018; Natarajan & Kumar, 2018), the mean velocity is

$$\bar{u} = \frac{d\bar{z}^*}{dt^*} = \frac{\mathcal{E}(r^4)}{\mathcal{E}(r^2)} \frac{\Delta P}{8\mu L_z}$$
(A5)

which is the volume averaged velocity, equation (18). The change of spatial variance over time is

$$\sigma_z^2 = \frac{\int_0^\infty (z^*(t^*;r))^2 r^2 p(r) dr}{\int_0^\infty r^2 p(r) dr} - (\bar{z}^*(t^*))^2$$
(A6)

$$= \left(\frac{E(r^{6})}{E(r^{2})} - \frac{E^{2}(r^{4})}{E^{2}(r^{2})}\right) \left(\frac{\Delta P}{8\mu L_{z}}t^{*}\right)^{2}$$
(A7)

$$= \left(\frac{\mathbf{E}(r^{6})\mathbf{E}(r^{2})}{\mathbf{E}^{2}(r^{4})} - 1\right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{E}(r^{4})}{\mathbf{E}(r^{2})}\frac{\Delta P}{8\mu L_{z}}t^{*}\right)^{2}$$
(A8)

$$= \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}(r^{6})\mathrm{E}(r^{2})}{\mathrm{E}^{2}(r^{4})} - 1\right)(\bar{u}t^{*})^{2}$$
(A9)

⁵⁹² The longitudinal dispersion coefficient is

$$D_{\rm L} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\sigma_z^2}{dt} = \left(\frac{{\rm E}(r^6){\rm E}(r^2)}{{\rm E}^2(r^4)} - 1\right) \bar{u}^2 t^*,\tag{A10}$$

which concludes the derivation of equation (21). The nondimensional solute transport equation is

$$\frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial t} + Pe_{\rm d} \frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial z} - \left(1 + (Pe_{\rm d})^2 t f(r)\right) \frac{\partial^2 \overline{C}}{\partial z^2} = 0. \tag{A11}$$

Following Crank (1975), the fundamental solution of the aforementioned transport equation is

$$\overline{C}(z,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi(t + (Pe_{\rm d}\,t)^2/2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(z - z_0 - Pe_{\rm d}\,t)^2}{4(t + (Pe_{\rm d}\,t)^2/2)}\right).$$
(A12)

We test the validity of the dispersion coefficient by comparing with volume-averaged solute concentration, equation (7). We consider two cases of pore size distributions R_1 and R_2 with initial injection at $z_0 = 0$ and $Pe_d = 10$.

Figure A1 shows the comparison between \overline{C} and C_{avg} at different time steps. When the travel distance increases, the difference between \overline{C} and C_{avg} increases. Such effect is more pronounced when σ is larger, as shown in the right panel of Figure A1. Higher order method of moments are employed for better modeling of dispersion effects (Chatwin, 1970; Zhang et al., 2008; Vikhansky & Ginzburg, 2014; Jiang & Chen, 2019). However, we limit our analysis to second order to focus on the topic of Darcy-scale reaction order.



Figure A1. Comparison of the volume-averaged solute concentration and the modeled concentration. The left panel shows the case of pore size distribution R_1 , and the right panel shows the case of pore size distribution R_2 .

⁶⁰⁷ Appendix B Taylor series of the averaged second-order kinetics model

⁶⁰⁸ The averaged second-order kinetics model, equation (51), is

$$\overline{C}' = Da_{\rm d} \left(1 - \overline{C}^2\right)^n. \tag{B1}$$

We show derivations of expanding equation (B1) using a Taylor series. A Taylor series expansion of \overline{C} around t = 0 is

$$\overline{C}(t) = \overline{C}(0) + \overline{C}'(0)t + \frac{\overline{C}''(0)}{2}t^2 + \frac{\overline{C}'''(0)}{6}t^3 + O(t^4),$$
(B2)

which consists of derivatives of \overline{C} . Differentiate equation (B1)

$$\overline{C}^{''} = -2 D a_{\rm d} n \left(1 - \overline{C}^2\right)^{n-1} \overline{C} \ \overline{C}^{'}. \tag{B3}$$

The initial condition, $\overline{C}(0) = 0$, leads to $\overline{C}''(0) = 0$, which corresponds to the second-

order term in equation (50). Instead of performing further differentiation, we rearrange equation (B1)

$$\overline{C}' = Da_{\rm d} \left(1 - \overline{C}\right)^n \left(1 + \overline{C}\right)^n.$$
(B4)

Applying the binomial approximation to $(1 + \overline{C})^n$ yields

$$\overline{C} \approx Da_{\rm d} \left(1 - \overline{C}\right)^n \left(1 + n\overline{C}\right) \text{ for } |n\overline{C}| \ll 1.$$
 (B5)

616 Differentiate

$$\overline{C}^{''} = Da_{\rm d} \, n \overline{C}^{'} \left(-\left(1 - \overline{C}\right)^{n-1} \left(1 + n \overline{C}\right) + \left(1 - \overline{C}\right)^{n} \right), \tag{B6}$$

which retains the property $\overline{C}''(0) = 0$. Further differentiate and omit \overline{C}''

$$\overline{C}^{'''} = Da_{\rm d} \, n\overline{C}^{'} \left(\left(n-1\right) \left(1-\overline{C}\right)^{n-2} \left(1+n\overline{C}\right) \overline{C}^{'} \right) \tag{B7}$$

$$-n\left(1-\overline{C}\right)^{n-1}\overline{C}'-n\left(1-\overline{C}\right)^{n-1}\overline{C}'\right).$$
(B8)

618 Hence,

$$\overline{C}^{'''}(0) = -(Da_{\rm d})^3 n(n+1).$$
 (B9)

⁶¹⁹ Therefore, the Taylor series with an approximated third-order derivative is

$$\overline{C}(t) = Da_{\rm d} t - \frac{n(n+1)}{6} (Da_{\rm d} t)^3 + O(t^4).$$
(B10)

Appendix C Numerical methods of the reactive transport model

The continuity equation of the concentration is

621

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (f(C)) = q, \tag{C1}$$

where f is a function that defines the flux and q represents a source or sink of the concentration. The conservative form of the continuity equation is

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} d\Omega + \int_{\partial \Omega} f(C) \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = \int_{\Omega} q d\Omega, \tag{C2}$$

where Ω is an arbitrary control volume, $\partial \Omega$ denotes the boundary of the control volume, and **n** is the outward normal vector of the control volume. Following Koren (1993), a cell-centered finite volume discretization of equation (C2) in one dimension is

$$\int_{\Omega_j} \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} dz + f(C) \bigg|_{j+1/2} - f(C) \bigg|_{j-1/2} = \int_{\Omega_j} q dz,$$
(C3)

where the half-integer indices j - 1/2 and j + 1/2 refer to the cell faces $\partial \Omega_{j-1/2}$ and $\partial \Omega_{j+1/2}$, as illustrated in Figure C1. Instead of approximating the fluxes with a firstorder upwind scheme, we utilize the κ interpolation scheme, originated from van Leer (1985),

$$f_{j+1/2} = f_j + \frac{1+\kappa}{4}(f_{j+1} - f_j) + \frac{1-\kappa}{4}(f_j - f_{j-1}), \ \kappa \in [-1,1].$$
(C4)

The flux term $f(C)|_{j+1/2}$ is abbreviated as $f_{j+1/2}$. We use a second-order upwind scheme, $\kappa = -1$, for linear advection f(C) = C such that

$$f_{j+1/2} = C_j + \frac{1}{2}(C_j - C_{j-1}).$$
 (C5)

Consider a Total Variation Diminishing (TVD) framework (Sweby, 1984), we define the ratio of concentration gradient assuming constant mesh size

$$r_{j+1/2} = \frac{f'(C)|_{j+1/2}}{f'(C)|_{j-1/2}} = \frac{C_{j+1} - C_j}{C_j - C_{j-1}}.$$
(C6)

⁶³⁵ A flux limiter is a function that selects spatial discretization schemes based on the ratio ⁶³⁶ of concentration gradient. In the case of linear advection, we apply the flux limiter ⁶³⁷ $\psi(r)$ to equation (C5)

$$f_{j+1/2} = C_j + \frac{\psi(r)}{2}(C_j - C_{j-1}).$$
(C7)

When $\psi(r) = 1$, we have the second-order upwind flux, and when $\psi(r) = r$, a centered

difference flux is recovered. Note that the flux reduces to first-order given $\psi(r) = 0$. We choose the minmod limiter (Roe, 1986)

$$\psi(r) = \max(0, \min(1, r)),$$
(C8)

which switches the advection flux between second-order upwind and centered difference in the second-order TVD region. Following the Discontinous Galerkin approach
(Rivière, 2008), we reformulate the reactive transport model in a single pore, equation (6),

$$\int_{\Omega} v \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} d\Omega + \int_{\partial \Omega} v \left(Pe C - \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} \right) \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = \int_{\Omega} v Da(1-C) d\Omega, \tag{C9}$$

where v is a piecewise constant test function. We calculate the diffusion flux using the two-point flux approximation. Closely following the derivations of Roy et al. (2019) and utilize the flux-limited advection, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} v \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_{\text{int}}} [v] \left(\operatorname{adv}(C) Pe \cdot \mathbf{n} + \frac{[C]}{h} \right) dS = \int_{\Omega} v Da(1-C) d\Omega, \quad (C10)$$

$$\operatorname{adv}(C) = C^{\operatorname{up}} + \frac{\psi(r)}{2} \left(C^{\operatorname{up}} - C^{\operatorname{upup}} \right), \qquad (C11)$$

where Γ_{int} denote the union of all interior boundaries, h is the distance between two cell centers, and [·] is the jump operator. The superscript "up" denotes the upwind cell, and "upup" represents the upwind cell of the aforementioned upwind cell. For example, when the surface integral is performed over $\partial\Omega_{j+1/2}$, the advection term is

$$\operatorname{adv}(C)\Big|_{j+1/2} = C_j + \frac{\psi(r)}{2}(C_j - C_{j-1}),$$
 (C12)

which is the advection flux, equation (C7). Before we define the temporal discretization scheme, we abbreviate equation (C10)

$$\int_{\Omega} v \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} d\Omega = -\int_{\Gamma_{\text{int}}} [v] \text{adv}(C) Pe \cdot \mathbf{n} dS - F^{\text{D}}(C) + F^{\text{q}}(C), \qquad (C13)$$

where $F^{D}(C)$ is the diffusion term, and $F^{q}(C)$ represents the reaction term. To approach second order accuracy in time, we utilize the explicit midpoint method

$$\int_{\Omega} v \frac{C^{n+1/2} - C^n}{0.5\Delta t} d\Omega = -\int_{\Gamma_{\text{int}}} [v] C^{\text{up},n} Pe \cdot \mathbf{n} dS - F^{\text{D}}(C^n) + F^{\text{q}}(C^n), \qquad (C14)$$
$$\int_{\Omega} v \frac{C^{n+1} - C^n}{\Delta t} d\Omega = -\int_{\Gamma_{\text{int}}} [v] \text{adv}(C^{n+1/2}) Pe \cdot \mathbf{n} dS$$
$$-F^{\text{D}}(C^{n+1/2}) + F^{\text{q}}(C^{n+1/2}), \qquad (C15)$$

where Δt is the time step size. The superscripts n, n+1/2, and n+1 refers to current time step, midpoint step, and the next time step, respectively. The midpoint value $C^{n+1/2}$ is approximated using first-order upwind advection. Then we apply the flux limiter to the second step. To ensure numerical stability, the explicit midpoint method should follow the time step size limitation proposed by (Prabhakaran & Jones Tarcius Doss, 2015)

$$\Delta t \le \frac{h^2}{2 + Pe\,h}.\tag{C16}$$

Although the time step size limitation is derived for flux-limited advection diffusion equations with no source terms, it is treated as a maximum value for the time step size in the simulations while using the explicit midpoint method. The time step size limitation restricts the efficiency of explicit methods. Rearrange equation (C16)

$$\frac{Pe\,\Delta t}{h} \le 1 - \frac{2\Delta t}{h^2},\tag{C17}$$

where $Pe \Delta t/h$ is the CFL number, and $2\Delta t/h^2$ is the Fourier number. The maximum CFL number allowed while using the explicit upwind scheme is 1 normally. However, the explicit centered difference treatment of diffusion causes a degradation of the maximum CFL number in equation (C17). To alleviate this issue, one may consider an implicit time discretization scheme for diffusion. This idea leads to the implicit-explicit (IMEX) time-discretization scheme, which consists of applying an implicit discretization for diffusion and an explicit one for advection (Ascher et al., 1997; Pareschi & Russo, 2005; Boscarino et al., 2015). Of many possible implementations of IMEX schemes, we implement the following

$$\int_{\Omega} v \frac{C^{n+1/2} - C^n}{0.5\Delta t} d\Omega = -\int_{\Gamma_{\text{int}}} [v] C^{\text{up},n} Pe \cdot \mathbf{n} dS - F^{\text{D}}(C^{n+1/2}) + F^{\text{q}}(C^n), \quad (C18)$$
$$\int_{\Omega} v \frac{C^{n+1} - C^n}{\Delta t} d\Omega = -\int_{\Gamma_{\text{int}}} [v] \text{adv}(C^{n+1/2}) Pe \cdot \mathbf{n} dS$$
$$-\frac{1}{2} F^{\text{D}}(C^{n+1/2}) - \frac{1}{2} F^{\text{D}}(C^{n+1}) + F^{\text{q}}(C^{n+1/2}), \quad (C19)$$

where both steps include implicit diffusion terms. We benchmark the numerical method based on the solution of tracer transport with first order decay

$$C(z,t) = 1 - \frac{M}{\sqrt{4\pi(t+t_0)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(z-z_0 - Pe\,t)^2}{4(t+t_0)} - Da\,t\right),\tag{C20}$$

where z_0 is the center of mass of the inverted Gaussian, M and t_0 are the parameters adjusted to bound the initial concentration between 0 and 1. In the benchmark, we set the initial condition with M = 0.2, $t_0 = 5 \times 10^{-3}$, and $z_0 = 0.5$. The mesh size, h, is 0.04. For the explicit midpoint scheme, the time step size is 5×10^{-4} , and for the IMEX scheme, the time step size is 5×10^{-3} . The simulation ends at 0.1 nondimensional time.

Figure C2 and C3 shows the benchmark result at different time steps, and both numerical solution agrees with the analytical solution. However, since the IMEX scheme allows larger time step size during simulations, we use only the IMEX scheme in our simulations.

Flow direction
$$\rightarrow$$

 $\Omega_{j-2} \quad \partial \Omega_{j-3/2} \quad \Omega_{j-1} \quad \partial \Omega_{j-1/2} \quad \Omega_j \quad \partial \Omega_{j+1/2} \quad \Omega_{j+1}$

Figure C1. An illustration of the cell-centered finite volume grid.



Figure C2. Benchmark of the numerical methods with analytical solutions of tracer transport with first-order decay using the explicit midpoint scheme. The CFL number is 0.25.



Figure C3. Benchmark of the numerical methods with analytical solutions of tracer transport with first order decay using the IMEX scheme. The CFL number is 2.5.

Acknowledgments 687

This work is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation project, entitled 688 "Analysing spatial scaling effects in mineral reaction rates in porous media with a hy-689 brid numerical model". We also thank the Werner Siemens-Stiftung (Werner Siemens 690 Foundation) for its support of the Geothermal Energy and Geofluids (GEG.ethz.ch) 691

Group at ETH Zurich, Switzerland. 692

References 693

694	Al-Khulaifi, Y., Lin, Q., Blunt, M. J., & Bijeljic, B. (2017). Reaction rates in chem-
695	ically heterogeneous rock: Coupled impact of structure and flow properties
696	studied by X-ray microtomography. Environmental Science Technology, 51,
697	4108–4116. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b06224
698	Al-Khulaifi, Y., Lin, Q., Blunt, M. J., & Bijeljic, B. (2018). Reservoir-condition
699	pore-scale imaging of dolomite reaction with supercritical CO_2 acidified
700	brine: Effect of pore-structure on reaction rate using velocity distribution
701	analysis. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control, 68, 99–111.
702	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2017.11.011
703	Al-Khulaifi, Y., Lin, Q., Blunt, M. J., & Bijeljic, B. (2019). Pore-scale dissolution
704	by CO_2 saturated brine in a multimineral carbonate at reservoir conditions:
705	Impact of physical and chemical heterogeneity. Water Resources Research, 55,
706	3171-3193. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR024137
707	Alnaes, M. S., Blechta, J., Hake, J., Johansson, A., Kehlet, B., Logg, A., Wells,
708	G. N. (2015). The FEniCS project version 1.5. Archive of Numerical Software,
709	3, 9-23. 10.11588/ans.2015.100.20553
710	Anderson, M. P. (2005). Heat as a ground water tracer. <i>Groundwater</i> , 43(6), 951–
711	968. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6584.2005.00052.x
712	Arriaza, J. L., & Ghezzehei, T. A. (2013). Explaining longitudinal hydrodynamic
713	dispersion using variance of pore size distribution. Journal of Porous Media,
714	16, 11–19. https://doi.org/10.1615/JPorMedia.v16.i1.20
715	Ascher, U. M., Ruuth, S. J., & Spiteri, R. J. (1997). Implicit-explicit Runge-Kutta
716	methods for time-dependent partial differential equations. Applied Numerical
717	Mathematics, 25(2), 151–167. (Special Issue on Time Integration) https://doi
718	.org/10.1016/S0168-9274(97)00056-1
719	Balakrishna, N., & Lai, C. D. (2009). Univariate distributions. In <i>Continuous bi</i> -
720	variate distributions: Second edition (pp. 1–32). New York, NY: Springer New

721	York. https://doi.org/10.1007/b101765_1
722	Balakrishnan, N. (1985). Order statistics from the half logistic distribution. Journal
723	of Statistical Computation and Simulation, 20(4), 287–309. https://doi.org/10
724	.1080/00949658508810784
725	Bishop, C. (2006). Pattern recognition and machine learning. Springer-Verlag New
726	York.
727	Blum, A. E., & Lasaga, A. C. (1987). Monte Carlo simulations of surface reaction
728	rate laws. In W. Stumm (Ed.), Aquatic surface chemistru: Chemical processes
729	at the particle-water interface (pp. 255–292). Wiley.
730	Boscarino, S., Bürger, R., Mulet, P., Russo, G., & Villada, L. M. (2015). Linearly
731	implicit IMEX Runge-Kutta methods for a class of degenerate convection-
732	diffusion problems. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 37(2), B305–B331.
733	https://doi.org/10.1137/140967544
734	Brantley, S. L. (2003). Reaction kinetics of primary rock-forming minerals under am-
735	bient conditions. In H. D. Holland & K. K. Turekian (Eds.). Treatise on geo-
736	chemistry (pp. 73–117). Oxford: Pergamon. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08
737	-043751-6/05075-1
738	Brantley, S. L. (2008). Kinetics of mineral dissolution. In S. L. Brantley, J. D. Ku-
739	bicki, & A. F. White (Eds.). <i>Kinetics of water-rock interaction</i> (pp. 151–210).
740	Springer. New York, NY.
741	Brantley, S. L., & Conrad, C. F. (2008). Analysis of rates of geochemical reactions.
742	In S. L. Brantley, J. D. Kubicki, & A. F. White (Eds.). <i>Kinetics of water-rock</i>
743	interaction (pp. 1–38). Springer, New York, NY.
744	Buscheck, T. A., Bielicki, J. M., Chen, M., Sun, Y., Hao, Y., Edmunds, T. A.,
745	Randolph, J. B. (2014). Integrating CO ₂ storage with geothermal resources
746	for dispatchable renewable electricity. <i>Energy Procedia</i> , 63, 7619–7630. (12th
747	International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies, GHGT-12)
748	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.796
749	Carbonell, R. G. (1979). Effect of pore distribution and flow segregation on disper-
750	sion in porous media. Chemical Engineering Science, 34, 1031–1039. https://
751	doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(79)80003-2
752	Chatwin, P. C. (1970). The approach to normality of the concentration distribution
753	of a solute in a solvent flowing along a straight pipe. Journal of Fluid Mechan-
754	ics, 43(2), 321–352. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112070002409
755	Crank, J. (1975). Concentration-dependent diffusion: Methods of solution. In The
756	mathematics of diffusion (2nd ed., pp. 104–136). Oxford University Press.
757	Cussler, E. L. (2009). Homogeneous chemical reactions. In Diffusion: Mass transfer
758	in fluid systems (3rd ed., p. 478—512). Cambridge University Press. https://
759	doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805134.019
760	Dentz, M., & de Barros, F. P. J. (2013). Dispersion variance for transport in hetero-
761	geneous porous media. Water Resources Research, 49(6), 3443–3461. https://
762	doi.org/10.1002/wrcr.20288
763	Ebigbo, A., Phillips, A., Gerlach, R., Helmig, R., Cunningham, A. B., Class, H., &
764	Spangler, L. H. (2012). Darcy-scale modeling of microbially induced carbon-
765	ate mineral precipitation in sand columns. Water Resources Research, 48(7).
766	https://doi.org/10.1029/2011WR011714
767	Endres, D. M., & Schindelin, J. E. (2003). A new metric for probability distribu-
768	tions. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 49, 1858–1860. https://doi
769	.org/10.1109/TIT.2003.813506
770	Feldmann, A., & Whitt, W. (1998). Fitting mixtures of exponentials to long-tail
771	distributions to analyze network performance models. Performance Evaluation,
772	31(3), 245–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-5316(97)00003-5
773	Fischer, C., Kurganskaya, I., Schäfer, T., & Lüttge, A. (2014). Variability of crys-
774	tal surface reactivity: What do we know? Applied Geochemistry, 43, 132–157.
775	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeochem.2014.02.002

Fischer, C., & Luttge, A. (2017).Beyond the conventional understanding of wa-776 ter-rock reactivity. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 457, 100–105. 777 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2016.10.019 778 Fogler, H. S. (2016). Elements of chemical reaction engineering. Prentice Hall. 779 Goltz, M. N., & Roberts, P. V. (1987).Using the method of moments to an-780 alyze three-dimensional diffusion-limited solute transport from temporal 781 Water Resources Research, 23(8), 1575–1585. and spatial perspectives. 782 https://doi.org/10.1029/WR023i008p01575 783 Gong, L., Nie, L., & Xu, Y. (2020).Geometrical and topological analysis of pore 784 space in sandstones based on X-ray computed tomography. *Energies*, 13, 3774. 785 https://doi.org/10.3390/en13153774 786 Hefny, M., Qin, C., Saar, M. O., & Ebigbo, A. (2020).Synchroton-based pore-787 network modeling of two-phase flow in nubian sandstone and implications for 788 capillary trapping of carbon dioxide. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas 789 Control, 103, 103164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2020.103164 790 Hussaini, S. R., & Dvorkin, J. (2021). Specific surface area versus porosity from 791 digital images. Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 196, 107773. 792 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2020.107773 793 Ioannidis, M., & Chatzis, I. (2000). On the geometry and topology of 3d stochas-794 Journal of Colloid and Interface Science, 229(2), 323–334. tic porous media. 795 https://doi.org/10.1006/jcis.2000.7055 796 Jiang, W., & Chen, G. (2019). Environmental dispersion in layered wetland: Mo-797 ment based asymptotic analysis. Journal of Hydrology, 569, 252–264. https:// 798 doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.12.005 799 Jung, H., & Navarre-Sitchler, A. (2018a).Physical heterogeneity control on ef-800 fective mineral dissolution rates. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 227, 246-801 263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2018.02.028 802 Jung, H., & Navarre-Sitchler, A. (2018b).Scale effect on the time dependence of 803 mineral dissolution rates in physically heterogeneous porous media. Geochim-804 ica et Cosmochimica Acta, 234, 70-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2018.05 805 .009 806 Karani, H., & Huber, C. (2017). Role of thermal disequilibrium on natural convec-807 tion in porous media: Insights from pore-scale study. Physical Review E, 95, 808 033123. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.95.033123 809 Kaufmann, G., & Dreybrodt, W. (2007).Calcite dissolution kinetics in the sys-810 tem CaCO₃-H₂O-CO₂ at high undersaturation. Geochimica et Cosmochimica 811 Acta, 71(6), 1398–1410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2006.10.024 812 Koch, T., Weishaupt, K., Müller, J., Weigand, B., & Helmig, R. (2021).A (dual) 813 network model for heat transfer in porous media. Transport in Porous Media. 814 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11242-021-01602-5 815 Koren, B. (1993). A robust upwind discretization method for advection, diffusion 816 and source terms. In C. Vreugdenhil & B. Koren (Eds.), Numerical methods 817 for advection-diffusion problems (pp. 117–138). Germany: Vieweg. 818 Kozeny, J. (1927). Über kapillare leitung des wassers im boden. Wien Akad. Wiss., 819 136, 271. 820 Kullback, S., & Leibler, R. A. (1951).On information and sufficiency. An-821 nals of Mathematical Statistics, 22, 79-86. https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/ 822 1177729694823 Lasaga, A. C. (1998). Kinetic theory in the earth sciences. Princeton University 824 Press. 825 Lee, J., Rolle, M., & Kitanidis, P. K. (2018). Longitudinal dispersion coefficients 826 for numerical modeling of groundwater solute transport in heterogeneous 827 Journal of Contaminant Hydrology, 212, 41–54. formations. (Advances 828 in Experimental Techniques, Validation of Modelling Tools and Uncer-829 tainty in Predictions from Pore to Field Scale) https://doi.org/10.1016/ 830

831	i.iconhvd.2017.09.004
832	Levene, M., & Kononovicius, A. (2019). Empirical survival Jensen-Shannon di-
833	vergence as a goodness-of-fit measure for maximum likelihood estimation and
834	curve fitting. Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation.
835	https://doi.org/10.1080/03610918.2019.1630435
836	Levenson Y & Emmanuel S (2013) Pore-scale heterogeneous reaction rates on a
837	dissolving limestone surface Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta 119 188–197
838	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2013.05.024
830	Li L Peters C A & Celia M A (2007) Effects of mineral spatial distribution
840	on reaction rates in porous media Water Resources Research 4.3 W01419
04U 9/1	https://doi.org/10.1029/2005WR004848
041	Li L & Salehikhoo F (2015) The role of magnesite spatial distribution patterns
842	in determining dissolution rates: When do they matter? <i>Ceechimica et Coe</i>
843	mochimica Acta 155 107–121 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2015.01.035
044	Li I. Salahikhao F. & Brantlay S. L. (2013) Magnesite dissolution rates at dif
845	forent apatial scales: The role of minoral spatial distribution and flow velocity
846	Coophimica at Cosmophimica Acta 108 01 106 https://doi.org/10.1016/
847	i rep 2013 01 010
848	J. Golobileboo E. Prontley, S. L. & Heideri, D. (2014) Spatial constian lim
849	LI, L., Salellikiloo, F., Diantiey, S. L., & Heidall, F. (2014). Spatial zonation infi-
850	196 555 572 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.goo.2012.10.051
851	120, 555-575. https://doi.org/10.1010/j.gca.2015.10.051
852	LI, R., Yang, C., Ke, D., & Liu, C. (2020). The scaling of mineral dissolution rates
853	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.goo.2020.01.048
854	Lin L (1001) Dimensional and the channel anthropy IEEE Through
855	Lin, J. (1991). Divergence measures based on the snannon entropy. <i>IEEE Transac-</i>
856	tions on Information Theory, 37, 145–151. https://doi.org/10.1109/18.01115
857	Lorenzo-Seva, U., & ten Berge, J. M. F. (2006). Tucker's congruence coefficient as a
858	meaningful index of factor similarity. <i>Methodology</i> , 2, 57–64. https://doi.org/
859	10.1027/1014-1881.2.2.57
860	Ma, J., Ankami, M., Saar, M. O., & Kong, XZ. (2021). Quantification of min-
861	eral accessible surface area and now-dependent nuid-mineral reactivity at $(10, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 100, $
862	the pore scale. <i>Chemical Geology</i> , <i>303</i> , 120042. https://doi.org/10.1016/
863	J.cnemgeo.2020.120042
864	Maher, K. (2010). The dependence of chemical weathering rates on fluid residence
865	time. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 294, 101–110. https://doi.org/10
866	.1016/J.epsi.2010.03.010
867	Mahmoodlu, M. G., Raoof, A., Bultreys, T., Van Stappen, J., & Cnudde, V. (2020).
868	Large-scale pore network and continuum simulations of solute longitudinal
869	dispersivity of a saturated sand column. Advances in Water Resources, 144,
870	103/13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2020.103/13
871	Melle, C., & Tuncay, K. (2006). Scale dependence of reaction rates in porous me-
872	dia. Advances in Water Resources, $29(1)$, $62-71$. https://doi.org/10.1016/j
873	.advwatres.2005.007
874	Meng, X., & Yang, D. (2017). Dynamic Dispersion Coefficient of Solutes Flowing in
875	a Circular Tube and a Tube-Bundle Model. Journal of Energy Resources Tech-
876	notogy, 140(1). (012903) https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4037374
877	Menke, H. P., Andrew, M. G., Blunt, M. J., & Bijeljic, B. (2016). Reservoir
878	condition imaging of reactive transport in heterogeneous carbonates us-
879	ing fast synchrotron tomography - effect of initial pore structure and flow
880	conditions. Chemical Geology, 428, 15–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/
881	J.cnemgeo.2016.02.0300009-2541
882	Menke, H. P., Reynolds, C. A., Andrew, M. G., Pereira Nunes, J. P., Bijeljic, B.,
883	& Blunt, M. J. (2018). 4d multi-scale imaging of reactive flow in car-
884	bonates: Assessing the impact of heterogeneity on dissolution regimes us-
885	ing streamlines at multiple length scales. Chemical Geology, 481, 27–37.

886	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2018.01.016
887	Moore, J., Lichtner, P. C., White, A. F., & Brantley, S. L. (2012). Using a re-
888	active transport model to elucidate differences between laboratory and field
889	dissolution rates in regolith. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 93, 235–361.
890	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2012.03.021
891	Nancollas, G. H. (1968). Kinetics of crystal growth from solution. Journal of Crystal
892	Growth, 3-4, 335–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0248(68)90170-X
893	Natarajan, N., & Kumar, G. S. (2018). Spatial moment analysis of multispecies
894	contaminant transport in porous media. Environmental Engineering Research,
895	23(1), 76-83. https://doi.org/10.4491/eer.2016.147
896	Navarre-Sitchler, A., & Brantley, S. (2007). Basalt weathering across scales. <i>Earth</i>
897	and Planetary Science Letters, 261, 321–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl
898	.2007.07.010
899	Naviaux, J. D., Subhas, A. V., Rollins, N. E., Dong, S., Berelson, W. M., & Ad-
900	kins, J. F. (2019). Temperature dependence of calcite dissolution ki-
901	netics in seawater. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 246, 363–384.
902	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2018.11.037
903	Nielsen, A. E. (1984). Electrolyte crystal growth mechanisms. Journal of Crystal
904	<i>Growth</i> , 67(2), 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0248(84)90189-1
905	Nielsen, F. (2020). On a generalization of the jensen-shannon divergence and
906	the jensen-shannon centroid. Entropy, 22, 221. https://doi.org/10.3390/
907	e22020221
908	Noiriel, C., Steefel, C. I., Yang, L., & Ajo-Franklin, J. (2012). Upscaling calcium
909	carbonate precipitation rates from pore to continuum scale. <i>Chemical Geology</i> ,
910	318–319, 60–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2012.05.014
911	Okada, M., Yamanishi, K., & Masuda, N. (2020). Long-tailed distributions of inter-
912	event times as mixtures of exponential distributions. Royal Society Open Sci-
913	ence, 7(2), 191643. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.191643
914	Oldham, K. B., Myland, J. C., & Spanier, J. (2009). The hyperbolic tangent tanh(x)
915	and cotangent $\operatorname{coth}(x)$ functions. In An atlas of functions (pp. 289–296). New
916	York, NY: Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-48807-3_31
917	Osterreicher, F., & Vajda, I. (2003). A new class of metric divergences on probabil-
918	ity spaces and its applicability in statistics. Annals of the Institute of Statisti-
919	Cat Mathematics, 55, 059-055. https://doi.org/10.1007/DF02517812
920	Paimer, A. N. (1991). Origin and morphology of limestone caves. GSA Bulletin,
921	103(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1130/0010-7000(1991)103(0001:OAMOLC)2.3
922	.00;2 Danagahi I. Iz Dugga C. (2005) Implicit complicit Dunna Kutta schemes and an
923	Pareschi, L., & Russo, G. (2005). Implicit-explicit Runge-Kutta schemes and ap-
924	ing 05 120 155 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10015.004.4626.4
925	mg, 20, 129-155. $mps.//doi.org/10.1007/S10915-004-4050-4$
926	Further resolution of 25°C and 1 atmosphere total pressure C achim
927	saturated solutions at 25 C and 1 atmosphere total pressure. $Geometry = \frac{1}{2} \int $
928	$0016_{-}7037(76)90176_{-}9$
929	Plummer I. N. Wigley, T. M. L. & Parkhurst D. L. (1078) The kinet-
930	is of calcite dissolution in CO ₂ -water system at 5 degrees to 60 degrees
931	C and 0.0 to 1.0 atm CO ₂ American Journal of Science 278, 179–216
932	https://doi.org/10.2475/ais.278.2.179
034	Pogge von Strandmann P A E Burton K W Snæbiörnsdóttir S O Sigfússon
934	B Aradóttir E S Gunnarsson I Gislason S R (2019) Rapid CO.
936	mineralisation into calcite at the CarbFix storage site quantified using cal-
937	cium isotopes. Nature Communications, 10(1983) https://doi.org/10.1038/
938	s41467-019-10003-8
939	Prabhakaran, S., & Jones Tarcius Doss, L. (2015). Total variation diminishing
940	finite volume schemes for one-dimensional advection-diffusion equation and

941 942 943	the relationship between flux limiter and mesh parameters.InternationalJournal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 101, 233–250.Retrieved fromhttps://ijpam.eu/contents/2015-101-2/9/9.pdfhttps://doi.org/10.12732/jipam.v101i2.9State
944 945	Reddy, M. M. (1975). Kinetics of calcium carbonate formation. In Interna-
946	tionale vereinigung für theoretische und angewandte limnologie: Verhand-
947	lungen (Vol. 19, pp. 429–438). Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.1080/
948	Beddy M M (1977) Crystallization of calcium carbonate in the presence of trace
949	concentrations of phosphorus-containing anions: L inhibition by phosphate and
951 952	glycerophosphate ions at ph 8.8 and 25° c. Journal of Crystal Growth, $41(2)$, 287–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0248(77)90057-4
953	Rivière, B. (2008). Discontinuous galerkin methods for solving elliptic and parabolic
954 955	equations. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. https://doi.org/10 .1137/1.9780898717440
956	Roe, P. L. (1986). Characteristic-based schemes for the euler equations. Annual Re-
957 958	view of Fluid Mechanics, 18, 337–365. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.fl.18 .010186.002005
959	Roy, T., Jönsthövel, T. B., Lemon, C., & Wathen, A. J. (2019). A block precon-
960	ditioner for non-isothermal flow in porous media. Journal of Computational
961	<i>Physics</i> , 395, 636–652. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2019.06.038
962	Saar, M. O. (2011). Review: Geothermal heat as a tracer of large-scale groundwa-
963	ter flow and as a means to determine permeability fields. Hydrogeology Jour-
964	nal, 19, 31–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-010-0657-2
965	Shi, D., Brown, P. W., & Ma, W. (1991). Lognormal simulation of pore size dis-
966	7/ 1861–1867 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2016.1001.tb07800.x
907	Shook G M (2001) Predicting thermal breakthrough in heterogeneous media from
969	tracer tests. <i>Geothermics</i> , 30(6), 573–589. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375
970	-6505(01)00015-3
971	Subhas, A. V., Rollins, N. E., Berelson, W. M., Dong, S., Erez, J., & Adkins, J. F.
972 973	(2015). A novel determination of calcite dissolution kinetics in seawater. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 170, 51–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/
974	j.gca.2015.08.011
975	Svensson, U., & Dreybrodt, W. (1992). Dissolution kinetics of natural calcite min-
976	erals in CO_2 -water systems approaching calcite equilibrium. <i>Chemical Geology</i> , 100(1), 100, 145 – https://doi.org/10.1016/00000.0541(00)00106 E
977	100(1), $129-145$. https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2541(92)90106-F Sweby P. K. (1084). High resolution schemes using flux limiters for hyperbolic con
978	servation laws SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis 21 995–1011 https://
980	doi.org/10.1137/0721062
981	Teng, H. H., Dove, P. M., & De Yoreo, J. J. (2000). Kinetics of calcite growth: sur-
982	face processes and relationships to macroscopic rate laws. Geochimica et Cos-
983	$mochimica \ Acta, \ 64 (13), \ 2255-2266. \qquad https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7037 (00)$
984	00341-0
985	van Leer, B. (1985). Upwind-difference methods for aerodynamic problems gov-
986	erned by the Euler equations. In Large-scale computations in fluid mechanics (Vol. 22, pp. 227, 226)
987	(vol. 22, pp. $527-550$). Vikhansky A & Cinzburg I (2014) Taylor dispersion in heterogeneous percus
980	media: Extended method of moments, theory, and modelling with two-
990	relaxation-times lattice boltzmann scheme. Physics of Fluids, 26(2), 022104.
991	https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4864631
992	Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., Haberland, M., Reddy, T., Courna-
993	peau, D., SciPy 1.0 Contributors (2020). SciPy 1.0: Fundamental al-
994	gorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nature Methods, 17, 261–272.
995	nttps://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2

- Wen, H., & Li, L. (2017). An upscaled rate law for magnesite dissolution in heterogeneous porous media. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 210, 289–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2017.04.019
- Wen, H., & Li, L. (2018). An upscaled rate law for magnesite dissolution in heterogeneous porous media: The role of time and length scales. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 235, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2018.04.024
- 1002White, A. F., & Brantley, S. L.(2003).The effect of time on the weather-1003ing of silicate minerals: why do weathering rates differ in the laboratory1004and field?Chemical Geology, 202, 479–506.1005i.chemgeo.2003.03.001

1006

1007

1008

- Zhang, Y., Benson, D. A., & Baeumer, B. (2008). Moment analysis for spatiotemporal fractional dispersion. Water Resources Research, 44(4), W04424. https:// doi.org/10.1029/2007WR006291
- 1009Zhao, Z., & Skelton, A. (2014). An assessment of the role of nonlinear reaction1010kinetics in parametrization of metamorphic fluid flow. Journal of Geo-1011physical Research: Solid Earth, 119, 6249–6262. https://doi.org/10.1002/10122014JB011016
- Øren, P.-E., & Bakke, S. (2003). Reconstruction of berea sandstone and pore-scale
 modelling of wettability effects. Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering,
 39(3), 177–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-4105(03)00062-7