Permeability evolution and production characteristics of inclined coalbed methane reservoirs on the southern margin of the Junggar Basin, Xinjiang, China
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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

The thick and steeply inclined coal seams of the Junggar Basin of Xinjiang, China, are unique with dip angles generally >50° but over the range 0°–85°. Initial and evolving permeability and pressures change drastically around wells down-dip within the steeply inclined reservoir as a result of the depth differential. Hence, the evolution of permeability and fluid pressures during drainage exhibits significant differences from those of flatlying or even slightly inclined reservoirs. We apply a hydro-mechanical model to evaluate the interaction of two-phase flows of gas and water in the inclined system. The influence of different reservoir inclinations (15°, 30°, 45°, 60°, and 75°) on the evolution of permeability, reservoir pressure, and gas production are explored through finite element modeling of this system. The results show that: 1) Reservoir inclination induces differences in permeability, reservoir pressure, gas content and methane production between the shallower updip reservoir and deeper downdip reservoir. The difference in permeability between the updip and downdip reservoirs is amplified as the dip angle increases and as drainage proceeds in the presence of the varying stress gradient. 2) An apparent asymmetric distribution of reservoir pressures results for wells along dip. The difference in reservoir pressure between the updip and downdip reservoirs intensifies as the inclination increases but lessens with the progress of drainage. The larger the dip angle, the smaller the final reservoir pressure. 3) The pressure reduction in the updip reservoir is larger than that in the downdip reservoir, resulting in the unsynchronized desorption of methane in the updip and downdip reservoirs. Methane within the updip reservoir desorbs preferentially over that in the downdip reservoir. For reservoir dip angles <45°, a single peak in methane production rate is apparent but this is supplanted by dual peaks for inclinations >45°. The time gap in gas desorption between the updip and downdip reservoirs results in the “dual-peak” on gas production profile. 4) A larger well spacing along the dip of a more highly inclined reservoir results in more efficient water drainage and gas production. An inverted trapezoidal well pattern is recommended to facilitate the drainage and gas production of reservoirs with significant dip angles.

\textbf{1. Introduction}

Coalbed methane (CBM), within in coal seams and in both adsorbed and free states, is one important form of unconventional energy,\textsuperscript{1,2} but it is also a greenhouse gas causes environmental pollution. In particular, large quantities of greenhouse gas are emitted during coal mining.\textsuperscript{3} Hence, produce more secured energy to satisfy energy consumer and reduce greenhouse gas emissions is a major challenge facing many countries.\textsuperscript{4,5} Global energy consumption has dramatically increased in past decades and is projected to keep increasing in the future.\textsuperscript{6} CBM utilization can help supplement energy supply, cut greenhouse gas emissions and reduce risks in coal mining. There is abundant CBM...
resource in China, the total CBM resource located shallower than 2000 m is about 36.8 trillion m$^3$, ranking third in the world. CBM reservoirs within China have various dip aspects. For example, strata dips within the Qinshui Basin range from 5° to 15°, those of the Sichuan Basin are in the range 15°–35°, while for the Junggar Basin in Xinjiang Province, which is a large superimposed basin dominated by Late Paleozoic and Mesozoic and Cenozoic continental deposits covering an area of $1.3 \times 10^5$ km$^2$, are in the range 0°–90° and generally greater than 50°–90° (Fig. 1). This is obviously different from other basins in China and typical coal-bearing sedimentary basins abroad. Different reservoir dip angles impact the evolving permeability and reservoir pressures, resulting in significant differences in the recoverable gas resource, the choice of drainage technology, and wellbore layout from those for slightly inclined or flat-lying coal beds. Thus, the modes of exploitation of the huge CBM resource of the Junggar Basin, Xinjiang, China must be thoughtfully selected.

Several multi-field and multi-phase physical models have been proposed to investigate the transport characteristics of gas and water in fractured coal seams. These include hydro-mechanical model (HM), thermohydro-mechanical-chemical models (THMC), a modified THMC model to increase the recovery of CBM through CO$_2$ injection (CO$_2$-ECBM), and another THMC model to enhance the recovery rate of CBM through adjusting the acid pressure (AF-ECBM). These models have offered suggestions to increase the permeability of the reservoir and to thereby enhance CBM production. When utilizing numerical simulation to evaluate CBM productivity, the reservoirs are commonly assumed to be horizontal because the encountered reservoirs in previous field CBM production are mainly horizontal or gently inclined (<15°). In these studies, the effects of volumetric forces of water and gas (the buoyancy and gravity) are neglected since they are weak for flat-lying and slightly inclined reservoirs. However, significant differences exist in the drainage and gas production processes between steeply-dipping and shallowly inclined reservoirs. Gas and water within steeply inclined fractured reservoirs are more prone to segregate due to the effects of gravity and buoyancy. Particularly, with increased inclination, the distribution of gas and water will have substantial variance between the updip and downdip reservoirs. Hence, the impact of reservoir inclination on the gas-water fluid system cannot be neglected. Some results and characteristics observed from previous studies in which the CBM reservoirs are set as flat-lying layers do not apply to the inclined reservoirs. Gravity tends to exert opposite impacts on the transport of water in the updip and downdip reservoirs. These effects, related to the stress gradient that is dependent on reservoir dip, result in significant differences in the evolution of permeability, reservoir pressure, and gas production rate between the updip and downdip parts of the reservoir and within the drainage radius of a single well. In different drainage stages, gas production is separately contributed from the updip and downdip parts of the reservoir and results in two peaks in the gas production rate profile. In recent studies, it has been suggested that for steeply inclined
reservoirs, permeability along the strike could also be severely affected by coal matrix shrinkage, resulting in asymmetric evolution of the permeability relative to the well.\textsuperscript{14,15} Thus, the influence of the deviatoric stress dependency of the reservoir dip on gas production cannot be ignored. Exploring the permeability evolution of reservoirs with different dip angles and identifying gas production characteristics is of great significance for optimizing wells layout and design of drainage process, which could also contribute to the recovery efficiency of inclined reservoirs.

Substantial studies have been conducted on reservoirs with limited or no inclination, but only a few studies have investigated the development of steeply inclined CBM reservoirs.\textsuperscript{10,11,14,27,28,33–35} Some in-depth studies neglect the evolution of permeability, the reservoir pressure and the production capacity of CBM. Deep understanding of the impacts of volumetric forces of gas and water and stress gradient related with seam dip angle on the evolution of permeability, reservoir pressure, and gas production is rare, which restricts the efficiently commercial development of CBM in the Junggar Basin of Xinjiang, China. Based on previous studies,\textsuperscript{10,36} a hydro-mechanical model considering the effects of gravity of water and buoyancy of gas is developed in this research. Influence of the stress gradient dependency of the reservoir dip on gas-water two-phase flow migration and gas production is emphasized. By analyzing the temporal and spatial evolution of reservoir pressure, permeability and gas production rate during gas drainage, the production characteristics of CBM in inclined reservoirs is revealed. This work contributes to the efficient recovery of the rich CBM resource of the inclined reservoirs on the southern margin of the Junggar Basin, Xinjiang, China.

2. The coupling model for CBM development in inclined coal seams

In the process of drainage and gas production, the change of effective stress and gas desorption leads to coal deformation, with feedbacks on coal permeability. Based on previous studies,\textsuperscript{20–23,24} we establish a coupling model incorporating the effects of water and gas for inclined CBM reservoirs. This model includes control of coal deformation on the stress field, the governing equations of gas-water two-phase flow migration and coupling with changes in porosity and permeability. Such couplings more faithfully reflect changes in gas and water migration, reservoir pressure, effective stress and permeability caused by their coupling in the process of CBM drainage and production, with specific application to inclined reservoirs.

2.1. Basic assumptions of the model

According to the characteristics of fracture and pore structure and gas adsorption/desorption behavior of coal reservoirs, the following assumptions are adopted.\textsuperscript{14,20–23,27,37–43}

1) The coal reservoir is a single-permeability (fracture) poroelastic continuum with dual-porosity (fractures/cleats and micro-pores in the matrix);
2) Methane is treated as an ideal gas, which exists and migrates in both the matrix pores and fractures of coal reservoir in adsorbed and free state, while water only exists and migrates within fractures of the coal reservoir;
3) The CBM and water saturate the entire matrix and fractures, and the dynamic process of adsorption/desorption of CBM in the matrix satisfies the Langmuir isotherm adsorption equation;
4) The CBM desorbs and is transported from matrix to fractures by diffusion (Fick’s law) and migrates along fractures by Darcian flow.

The general interactions between methane and water in the CBM reservoir are shown schematically in Fig. 2.

\begin{equation}
\varepsilon_{\mu i} = \frac{1}{2G} \varepsilon_{\mu i} - \left( \frac{1}{6G} - \frac{1}{9K} \right) \varepsilon_{\delta i} \varepsilon_{\delta i} + \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon_{\delta i} \varepsilon_{\delta i} + \frac{1}{3K} \left( \alpha_i p_{mg} + \alpha_f p_f \right) \delta_{\mu i} 
\end{equation}

where $\varepsilon_{\mu i}$ is the strain tensor in the $\mu$ direction, $\varepsilon$ is the total stress tensor, and $\varepsilon_{\delta i}$ is the total strain tensor, and $\varepsilon_{\delta i}$ is the volume strain within the matrix caused by gas adsorption/desorption, which is fitted onto Langmuir-type curves and has been verified through experiments.\textsuperscript{65,66} The Langmuir-type equation can be expressed as:\textsuperscript{63,64} $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_p / \left( \varepsilon_p + \varepsilon_m \right)$, in which $\varepsilon$ is the Langmuir-type strain coefficient, representing the maximum adsorption-induced strain; $p_i$ is the Langmuir gas pressure constant, Pa; and $p_m$ is the gas pressure in the matrix, Pa. $\delta_{\mu i}$ in Eq. (1) is the Kronecker delta with 1 for $\mu = i$ and 0 for $\mu \neq i$; $\sigma_{\delta i}$ is the total stress tensor, and $\sigma_{\delta i}$ is the normal stress component; $\sigma_{\delta i} = \sigma_{i1} + \sigma_{i2} + \sigma_{i3}$; $\alpha_{i}$ is Biot effective stress coefficient for the matrix, $\alpha_{\delta i} = 1 - K/K_{\delta i}; K_{\delta i}$ represents the bulk modulus of the coal grains, $\alpha_{i}$; $\sigma_{\delta i} = \sigma_{i1} + \sigma_{i2} + \sigma_{i3}$; $\alpha_{i}$ is Biot effective stress coefficient for the fracture network, $a_f = 1 - K/K_{f i}; K_{f i}$ is the gas pressure in the matrix, Pa; $p_f$ is the total fluid pressure within the fractures, including gas pressure and water pressure, $p_f = s_g p_g + s_w p_w$, Pa; $s_g$ is gas phase saturation, $s_g + s_w = 1$; and, $p_{gw}$ is the gas pressure in the fractures, Pa; $p_{gw}$ is the water pressure in the fractures, Pa.

The deformation-strain and stress equilibrium relationships for the coal reservoir can be expressed as follows:

\begin{equation}
\varepsilon_{\mu i} = \frac{1}{2} (u_{\mu i} + u_{i\mu})
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\sigma_{\mu i} + F_i = 0
\end{equation}

where $u_{\mu i}$ is displacement in the $k$-direction, m; $F_i$ is the body force in the $k$-direction, N.

Combining Eqs. (1)-(3), the governing equation for the combined deformation and stress field within the coal reservoir is defined as:
2.2.2. Governing equations of gas-water two-phase flow

The pores and fractures within the coal reservoir are saturated with a mixture of gas and water. The gas migrates both in the coal matrix and fractures, while only water is transported in the fractures. The transfer of methane from coal matrix to fractures occurs in two steps: first, the adsorbed gas desorbs from the surface of the pores in the coal matrix, diffuses through the bulk matrix then flows into and through the fractures/voids. This process obeys Fick’s and Darcy’s laws, and the transportation of gas and water in coal fractures obeys Darcy’s law.

The diffusion of methane from coal matrix to fractures can be expressed as:  

\[ \frac{\partial m_g}{\partial t} = -3 \pi^2 D M_g \left( p_{mg} - p_{p} \right) \]  

where \( m_g \) is the mass of gas in the matrix, kg; \( M_g \) is the molar mass of methane, kg/mol; \( R \) is the molar constant of methane, J/(mol\( \cdot \)K); \( T \) is the temperature of coal reservoir, K; \( D \) is the gas diffusion coefficient, m\(^2\)/s; and \( L \) is the cleat spacing, m.

The gas in coal reservoir matrix contains both adsorbed gas and free gas, so the mass of gas in the matrix can be expressed as:

\[ m_g = M_g V, \text{ and } m_g \text{ is adsorbed gas mass, kg.} \]

Free methane may be present within fractures. The governing equations controlling stress and gas migration in coal reservoir fractures can be obtained from the conservation of mass as:

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{M_g}{R T} \right) \left( \frac{V_t p_{mg}}{p_{mg} + p_{f}} + \frac{M_g}{R T} \frac{p_{mg}}{p_{f}} \right) = -3 \pi^2 D M_g \left( p_{mg} - p_{f} \right) \]

Free gas

2.2.3. Permeability coupling equation

In coal reservoirs, permeability and porosity respond to coal deformation with this impacting gas-water two-phase transport. Fracture porosity of the coal reservoir can be expressed as:

\[ \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_{f0}} = 1 + \frac{\Delta L_f}{L_f} \]

where \( L_f \) is the aperture of fracture in coal mass, and the subscript “0” denotes the initial value of the corresponding variables.

Substituting Eqs. (12) and (13) into Eq. (14), then the fracture permeability can be expressed as:

\[ \frac{k_f}{k_{f0}} = \left[ 1 - \frac{3}{\rho_{f0} + 3 K_f/K} (\Delta e_f - \Delta e_c) \right]^3 \]

Eqs. (4), (8), (9) and (15) define coupled coal deformation and migration of gas-water two-phase flow in dual-porosity media. In the hydro-mechanical model, the governing equations are nonlinear second-order partial differential equations (PDEs) in space and first-order PDEs in time. These equations cannot be theoretically and analytically solved because of the nonlinearity in both the space and time domains.

Therefore, we implement these coupled equations into solid mechanics and PDE modules of the finite element software - COMSOL Multiphysics to evaluate the interaction of two-phase flows of gas and water in the inclined system via the discrete and finite-element method. The solid mechanics module is used to describe Eq. (4) and the gas-water two-phase flow in the fracture system are represented by the PDE modules (Eqs. (7)-(9)).

To concisely illustrate the research flow of work in this study, a chart is presented as below (Fig. 3).

2.3. Parameters in the coupling model

A simplified physical model is established to appropriately represent the field conditions. The model size is 300 m \( \times \) 300 m \( \times \) 5 m. The drainage well is located in the middle of the coal seam, with a diameter of 0.2 m and the bottom hole depth of 800 m, and the thickness of the coal seam is 5 m. Five scenarios are developed with different coal seam dip angles of 15°, 30°, 45°, 60° and 75°. The coal seam burial depth ranges from 655.1 m to 944.9 m. According to the average volume weight of the overlying strata above the coal seam under the above five different coal seam dip angle conditions, an equivalent load is applied to...
Fig. 3. The research flow chart of this study.

Fig. 4. Meshed coalbed for simulation (taking a dip inclination of 45° as an example).
the upper boundary of the model. The borders around and at the bottom of the model are fixed. All external boundaries are insulated and impermeable to methane and water. Therefore, under initial conditions, the coal seam is considered to be in a free stress state, and the initial reservoir pressure is determined by the reservoir pressure gradient. The model is divided into grid of free triangles, with a transect AB traversing the center of the model along the dip and containing two groups of symmetrical monitoring points (points 1 and 4, and points 2 and 3) respectively 50 m (points 2 and 3) and 100 m (points 1 and 4) from the drainage well (Fig. 4, taking the dip angle 45° as an example). Table 1 defines the basic geomechanical parameters for the coupled model, which as derived from field data and relevant research literature.¹⁲⁻¹⁴,¹⁶⁻¹⁸

3. Results and analysis

3.1. Temporal and spatial evolution of permeability in reservoirs of various inclinations

During the process of drainage and gas production the permeability is controlled jointly by effective stress and the desorption of methane. In the initial stage of drainage, the coal reservoir mainly produces water with the effect of reducing water pressure, increasing effective stress and compacting voids within the coal matrix. As water drainage proceeds, the positive effect of increase in water pressure, increasing effective stress and caused by methane desorption ultimately overwhelms the counter effect of increased effective stress – this results in the net swelling of voids in the matrix. As a result of this, permeabilities in reservoirs of different dips first decrease and then increase (Fig. 5). Different degrees of asymmetric evolution in permeability result at symmetrically disposed updip and downdip measuring locations. For coal reservoirs with different inclinations (scenarios 1 to 5 representing dips inclinations of 15°–75°) the difference in the permeability ratio (k/k₀) at 2200 days, between the upper (point 1) and lower (point 2) measuring locations within the updip coal reservoir (the permeability ratio of point 2 minus that of point 1) were 0.01, 0.01, 0.01, 0.01, and 0.03 respectively. However, the difference-value in the ratio (k/k₀) between the upper measuring location (point 3) and the lower measuring location (point 4) within the downdip coal reservoir (the permeability ratio of point 3 minus that of point 4) were higher as 0.02, 0.03, 0.05, 0.06, and 0.09 respectively. The difference-values in the downdip permeability ratios (k/k₀) are clearly greater than those in the updip direction, indicating a greater variance in permeability along the downdip leg of the reservoir.

For reservoirs at various inclinations, the drawdown time for permeability ratio to reach its lowest value (the duration from the initial value of the permeability ratio to the lowest value) at measuring point 1 was observed on drainage days 1005, 918, 786, 612, and 376, respectively. The recovery time to then climb from this minimum permeability ratio back to k/k₀ = 1 was 1915, 1633, 1342, 1032, and 659 days of drainage. The detailed timeline of the drawdown and recovery is presented in Tables 2 and 3 for measuring points 2 (above) and 3 and 4 (below drainage well). It is worth mentioning that the permeability at measuring point 4 failed to recover for inclinations of 15°, 30°, and 45°. The recovery of permeability at inclinations of 60° and 75° occurred on days 2192 and 1637 of drainage. The comparison between permeability drawdown and recovery times reveals that the drawdown time for the permeability tends to decrease with increasing inclination. Closer distances from the production well return a shorter rebound time and a greater recovery in the permeability. Compared with the downdip limb of a reservoir, the updip limb demonstrates shorter drawdown and recovery times (Tables 2 and 3, and Fig. 5) reflecting the impacts of reduced in situ effective stresses at shallower depths and potentially larger changes in pressure driven by gravity drainage.

The permeability drawdown then recovery is mainly caused by the effective stresses and the matrix shrinkage under the desorption of methane. Water drainage and methane production tend to increase the effective stresses, resulting in a reduction in permeability. While the desorption of methane leads to shrinkage of the matrix, resulting in an increase in permeability. The differences in the updip and downdip direction affect the drainage, resulting in variances in the separation of gas and water. Lower inclinations are often accompanied with slower downward water drainage and limited gas and water separation. Higher inclinations, on the other hand, often accelerate the drainage and results in more severe gas and water separation. In practice, the spacing between wells along the dip of reservoirs with varying inclinations should be discreetly selected according to the effective reach of a single well. A larger well spacing along the dip of a more highly inclined reservoir might result in more efficient water drainage and gas production.

We define the ratio, equal to the maximum absolute permeability divided by the minimum permeability during drainage within the updip/downdip limb of the reservoir, as the permeability difference factor of the updip/downdip reservoir. This factor may be used to evaluate the asymmetric development of permeability between the updip and downdip reservoirs. For reservoirs with various inclinations (scenarios 1–5), at the initial stage (on drainage day 0), the permeability difference factors were identified as 1.36, 1.81, 2.32, 2.80, and 3.17, which changed into 1.31, 1.71, 2.13, 2.46, and 2.49 on production day 1000, 1.28, 1.67, 2.08, 2.39, and 2.44 on production day 1500, and then 1.27, 1.64, 2.04, 2.35, and 2.40 after 2000 days of drainage (Table 4 and Fig. 6). The permeability difference factor on the updip limb of the reservoir tends to increase with inclination, which decreases as drainage and gas production proceed. It is surmised that gravity drainage is enhanced for greater inclinations of the updip part of the reservoir, resulting in a greater permeability difference factor. However, as drainage and gas production proceed, the negative effect of decreased permeability with increased effective stress is suppressed by the positive effect of matrix shrinkage. Therefore, the difference factor of the updip limb of the reservoir tends to decrease with gas production.

In the downdip direction of the seam, and initially (drainage day 0), the permeability difference factors were identified as 1.36, 1.81, 2.31, 2.79, and 3.15, which changed to 1.77, 2.47, 3.47, 5.03, and 7.17 on production day 1000, 1.84, 2.56, 3.61, 5.21, and 7.15 on production day 1500, and 1.90, 2.65, 3.69, 5.29, and 7.08 after 2000 days of drainage (Table 5 and Fig. 7). Similar to the updip part, the permeability difference factor in the downdip part also tends to increase with growing inclination. It is worth mentioning that the permeability difference factor at inclinations of 15°, 30°, 45°, and 60° tends to increase as gas production proceeds. When the reservoir inclination reaches 75°, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values and Units</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values and Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desorption time τ</td>
<td>8.71 d</td>
<td>Langmuir pressure constant P_L</td>
<td>3.034 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus of coal E</td>
<td>3000 MPa</td>
<td>Langmuir volume constant V_L</td>
<td>0.036 m³/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio of coal ν</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>The density of coal skeleton ρ_s</td>
<td>1400 kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial porosity of coal matrix φ_0</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>Rock density ρ_r</td>
<td>2500 kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial porosity of fracture φ_f</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Pumping negative pressure p_r</td>
<td>0.201 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capillary pressure p_cap</td>
<td>0.05 MPa</td>
<td>Initial water saturation S_w0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas dynamic viscosity μ</td>
<td>1.03 × 10⁻⁵ Pa s</td>
<td>Initial gas saturation S_g0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water dynamic viscosity μ_w</td>
<td>1.01 × 10⁻³ Pa s</td>
<td>Biot effective stress coefficient for the coal matrix α_m</td>
<td>0.99436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracture stiffness K_f</td>
<td>4.8 GPa</td>
<td>Biot effective stress coefficient for the fracture network α_f</td>
<td>0.17136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5. Permeability ratio at various measuring locations for coal reservoirs with different inclinations (a-15°, b-30°, c-45°, d-60°, e-75°).

Table 2
Rebound time (day) for the permeability ratio at four measuring points for coal reservoirs with different inclinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring point</th>
<th>The dip angle of the reservoir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Recovery time (day) for the permeability ratio at four measuring points for coal reservoirs with different inclinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring point</th>
<th>The dip angle of the reservoir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
permeability difference factor of the downdip part of the reservoir first increases and then decreases as gas production proceeds. As drainage proceeds, effective stress impacts dominate the preliminary drainage stage, resulting in an increase in the permeability difference factor of the downdip reservoir. However, at the later stage of drainage, less water remains and drainage slows. Gas desorption effects overpower the permeability reduction effects of increased effective stress, resulting in a reduction in permeability difference factor in the downdip part of the reservoir.

Similarly, the ratio between the peak absolute permeability in the updip part of the reservoir and the minimum absolute permeability in the downdip part of the reservoir is defined as the permeability difference factor of the entire reservoir. This ratio could be adopted to evaluate the asymmetric difference in permeability between the updip and downdip portions of the reservoir. For reservoirs with various inclinations (15°, 30°, 45°, 60°, 75°), at the initial stage (day 0), the permeability difference factors were identified as 1.86, 3.30, 5.42, 7.92, and 10.10 respectively, which changed to 1.90, 3.47, 5.82, 8.63, and 11.21 on production day 1000, and then 1.91, 3.48, 5.86, 8.75, and 11.36 on production day 1500, and finally to 1.92, 3.50, 5.87, 8.77, and 11.50 after production for 2000 days (Table 6, Figs. 6 and 7). Clearly, the permeability difference factor of the entire inclined reservoir increases as the inclination grows and as production proceeds. This indicates that the permeability across the entire reservoir is affected by both the inclination and drainage time. Steeply inclined reservoirs better favor water drainage, resulting in a larger reservoir pressure drop and larger changes in effective stress together with an asymmetric distribution of the permeability with regard to the drainage well.

Table 4
Permeability difference factors for the updip part of the reservoir for different inclinations after different production times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production time (day)</th>
<th>The dip angle of the reservoir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Permeability difference factor for the downdip portion of reservoirs with different inclinations after different production times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production time (day)</th>
<th>The dip angle of the reservoir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Evolution of absolute permeability in the updip part of reservoirs with varying inclinations (a-15°, b-30°, c-45°, d-60°, e-75°).
According to the above analysis, in the updip reservoir, the permeability difference factor decreases with drainage and gas production. In the downdip reservoir, the difference factor increases with drainage and gas production. However, the permeability difference factor for the entire reservoir also increases as gas production proceeds, indicating that the permeability changes more in the downdip reservoir, which dominates the permeability evolution of the entire reservoir.

### 3.2. Temporal and spatial evolution of reservoir pressure in inclined reservoirs

The reservoir pressure often refers to the total fluid pressure in the fracture of the coal seam, including both gas and water pressures. As demonstrated in Fig. 8, the pressure for reservoirs with different inclinations varies as the drainage and gas production proceed. The asymmetric character of the reservoir pressure distribution is identified between the updip and downdip reservoirs. The largest difference in reservoir pressure between the updip and downdip reservoirs is exhibited after production for 1000 days. The greater the dip angle, the more obvious this asymmetry of the pressure distribution. Under gravity, the drainage is facilitated within the updip part of the reservoir, but is suppressed within the downdip part. This results in the reservoir pressure in the downdip part of the reservoir always being greater than that in the updip reservoir.

Fig. 9 shows resulting changes in reservoir pressure of seams with dip angles of 15°, 45°, and 75° from production day 400 to 2000. Clearly, an increase in inclination leads to a greater pressure difference between the updip and downdip reservoirs. As water drainage and gas production proceed, the pressure distribution difference between the updip and downdip reservoirs all become smaller for reservoirs with different dip angles. Furthermore, a greater inclination returns a lower final reservoir pressure across the entire seam, indicating improved performance in drainage and gas production.

Fig. 10 displays changes in reservoir pressure of seams with various dip angles (from 15° to 75°) as gas production proceeds. Due to the effects of gravity and water drainage, the pressure in the updip and downdip reservoirs drops quickly, followed by a slower rate of pressure

### Table 6

Permeability difference factors for reservoirs with different inclinations after different production times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production time (day)</th>
<th>The dip angle of the reservoir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above analysis, in the updip reservoir, the permeability difference factor decreases with drainage and gas production. In the downdip reservoir, the difference factor increases with drainage and gas production. However, the permeability difference factor for the entire reservoir also increases as gas production proceeds, indicating that the permeability changes more in the downdip reservoir, which dominates the permeability evolution of the entire reservoir.
drop due to continuing drainage and gas desorption. As the seam inclination increases, the pressure drops in both updip and downdip reservoirs tend to become more pronounced as drainage and gas production proceed (Table 7 and Table 8). A statistical analysis reveals that at a location 50 m away from the production well, the pressure drops in the updip reservoirs (at measuring point 2) at inclinations of 15°, 30°, 45°, and 60° first increase and then decrease. The pressure drop in the updip reservoir (at measuring point 2) at an inclination of 75° consistently reduces with gas production. However, pressure drops in the downdip reservoirs (at measuring point 3) at varying inclinations (15°–75°) all decrease as gas production continues. The maximum pressure drops in both updip (at measuring point 2) and downdip reservoirs (at measuring point 3) are observed for the 75° inclined seam, which are individually 21.1% and 27.1% (Table 7). The pressure drops in both updip and downdip reservoirs with different dip angles at a location 100 m from the production well (measuring points 1 and 4) exhibit a similar evolutionary trend as those 50 m from the well (measuring points 2 and 3). Overall, the largest pressure drops in the updip and downdip reservoirs are 22.3% and 23.9% respectively (Table 8).

3.3. Evolution of gas content in reservoirs with various inclinations

The evolution of gas content in reservoirs with different dip angles also exhibits different degrees of asymmetry at symmetrical positions in the updip and downdip reservoirs relative to the production well. This is clearly different from the symmetrical evolution of gas content in horizontal reservoirs around the production well. For a seam with a smaller inclination (15°), limited variances exist in the initial reservoir pressure, permeability and other fluid parameters between the updip and downdip reservoirs, resulting in an approximate symmetrical distribution and evolution of gas content in the initial drainage stage with regard to the
However, for a steeply inclined seam (e.g., ≥45°), the stress gradient increases within the reservoir, resulting in a more severe separation of gas and water. Physical properties of the reservoir also change more rapidly along the dip, resulting in a more distinctly asymmetric distribution of gas content relative to the well (Fig. 11).

3.4. Evolution of methane production and model validation

Reservoirs with various inclinations are characterized by different initial mechanical properties and permeabilities. This results in differences in the evolution of reservoir pressure, gas content and permeability, and eventually methane production. The cumulative methane production of seams with different dip angles is listed in Fig. 12. When the inclination increases from 15° to 75°, the cumulative CH₄ production (on production day 2200) grows from $3.04 \times 10^6$ m³ to $4.98 \times 10^6$ m³, up by 63.8%, indicating that a greater dip angle facilitates the drainage of the reservoir, and is beneficial to gas desorption and production.

The daily gas production follows the overall trend of first decreasing then increasing - then as drainage continues, the daily production starts to slowly drop (Fig. 13). The daily gas production accordingly increases as the seam dip angle increases, which of a seam at an inclination of 75° is approximately 1–2 times that of a seam at other small inclinations (<75°). Moreover, as the dip angle increases, the daily production rebound arises later. It is worth noting that when the dip angle is less than 45°, there is only one single peak on the daily gas production profile. However, when the inclination is ≥45°, as water drainage and gas production proceed, the speed of daily gas production decline slows down. We define this segment curve with a smaller rate of decline on the daily gas production profile as the second peak (as indicated by the red dashed arrow in Fig. 13). That is, the “dual-peak” emerges on the production profile of a reservoir with an inclination ≥45°. After reaching the second peak, the daily gas production continues to decline slowly. It is believed that this characteristic of “dual-peak” in the evolution of gas production for steeply inclined reservoirs real exists. Because the similar and more distinct feature has been observed on the actual gas production profiles from the well group 15 (Fig. 14a) and other 8 wells (multi-layer: CSD03, CSD04, CSD05, CS11-X2, and CSP06-1V; single layer: CSD01, CSD02, and CS11-X1) (Figs. 14b), which are distributed in the Badaowan Formation of the west Fukang Block on the southern margin of the Junggar Basin. The dip angle of reservoirs there is generally greater than 50°.

As shown in Figs. 13 and 14, the time gaps between the dual peaks on the observed gas production profiles (Fig. 14) are obviously discrete due to the complex on-site geological conditions, while are not discrete for those time gaps on production profiles from numerical simulation (Fig. 13). The appearance of the dual peaks tends to move forward in
time as inclination increases, also resulting in a shorter time gap between the twin peaks (Fig. 13). Specifically, the gaps between these two peaks are 1194 days, 975 days, and 818 days corresponding to seams at inclinations of 45°, 60°, and 75° respectively. It’s surmised that the water drainage decays in the updip reservoir prior to that in the downdip reservoir, and it is the same for gas desorption between the updip and downdip reservoirs. Therefore both the dual peaks emerge earlier and forms a shorter time gap for seams with larger dip angles. Both the daily gas productions of the well group 15 and other 8 wells (average daily production) observed on-site are larger compared with that of a single well in the numerical simulation. The peak daily gas production from the simulation is ~1800–3000 m³/d. While the peak daily gas production of well group 15 and other 8 wells (average daily production) are approximately 7000–8000 m³/d and 6000–8000 m³/d, respectively. This is speculated reasonable since the former came from a single inclined reservoir, but the latter came from the well group and a well penetrating multi layers. Above analysis also indirectly proves the rationality of the model, indicating that the model is effective.

Table 7
Pressure drops corresponding to seams with different inclinations after different production periods (at a location 50 m away from the production well, measuring points 2 (updip) and 3 (downdip)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production time (day)</th>
<th>400–1000</th>
<th>1000–1600</th>
<th>1600–2200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Pressure drops corresponding to seams with different inclinations after different production periods (at site 100 m away from the production well, measuring points 1 (updip) and 4 (downdip)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production time (day)</th>
<th>400–1000</th>
<th>1000–1600</th>
<th>1600–2200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 10. Distribution of reservoir pressure around the well along the central dip direction for seams with varying inclinations (a-15°, b-30°, c-45°, d-60°, e-75°) from production day 400–2200.
for examining the CBM development in steeply inclined reservoirs.

The occurrence of dual peaks on the daily gas production profile is mainly attributed to the increasing differences in permeability and reservoir pressures between the updip and downdip reservoirs with growing inclination. In Fig. 13, during stage I of gas production (early stage), the fluid pressure drops and the effective stress gradually increases as the water and gas are drained from both the updip and downdip reservoirs. This results in the dominance of effective stress on permeability evolution. The pores within the matrix compact, reducing permeability in both the updip and downdip reservoirs, eventually resulting in reduced methane production. In stage I, methane mainly comes from the updip reservoir. During stage II of gas production (mid-stage), when the updip reservoir pressure drops to the threshold of gas desorption and change in permeability is dominated by gas desorption. However, the downdip reservoir is still within the main drainage stage, resulting in a greater permeability difference which triggers the rebound of methane production. In addition, gas production increases with reservoir inclination and the updip reservoir contributes more methane. During stage III (late stage), as the intensive drainage of the downdip reservoir ends, both the updip and downdip reservoirs contribute to methane production, resulting in the emergence of the second peak of gas production. During stage III, the methane production is mainly contributed by the downdip reservoir.

According to the foregoing analysis, the steeply-inclined reservoir results in large differences in physical properties of the shallow updip reservoir and deep downdip reservoir, especially the permeability, reservoir pressure, and gas content. These changes cause the unsynchronized desorption of methane in the updip and downdip reservoirs. It is inferred that methane in the updip reservoir desorbs preferentially over that in the downdip reservoir. The time gap in gas desorption between the updip and downdip reservoirs results in the “dual-peak” on the production profile. The first daily production peak is mainly caused

![Fig. 11. Methane content corresponding to inclined seams with various inclinations (a-15°, b-30°, c-45°, d-60°, e-75°).](image-url)
by methane desorption in the updip reservoir, and methane desorption in the downdip reservoir contributed more to the second production peak.

4. Discussion

This work follows from Kang et al. and adds hydro-mechanical coupling to accommodate the effects of water and gas (the buoyancy and gravity) for steeply inclined reservoirs. The field case was used to verify the accuracy of the numerical simulation results. With this model, we have investigated the temporal and spatial evolution of permeability, pressure, gas content, and methane production during the process of water drainage and gas extraction in reservoirs with various inclinations. This study identifies the variance in permeability and methane production and provides insights into well-type selection and layouts in such steeply dipping seams (~50°–85°) common within the Junggar Basin of Xinjiang Province.

4.1. Comparison with previous studies

Many studies have been conducted to probe permeability evolution and to promote the development of CBM. However, these studies are mainly aimed at horizontal or slightly inclined reservoirs according to the field geological conditions. Even inclined seams with a dip angle around 15° are also assumed to be horizontal layers for simplicity. This is inappropriate, especially for steeply inclined reservoirs (>45°) on the southern margin of the Junggar Basin, China, in which the migration of gas and water significantly differs much from that in horizontal coal seams due to the stress gradient and buoyancy of both gas and water. Taking the seam with a dip angle of 45° as an example, for an inclined 300 m × 300 m square area, the burial depth difference is 212 m between the upper and lower boundaries of the seam. This obviously impacts the initial physical parameters of the reservoir, which has been accommodated in our model. We reproduced the “deal-peak” characteristic of gas production profiles of steeply inclined reservoirs through discrete and finite element numerical simulation. The mechanism of this characteristic has been revealed through analyzing the spatiotemporal evolution of permeability and reservoir pressure in both the updip and downdip reservoirs. Besides, the literature qualitatively reported the characteristic of “gas–water separation” in the process of water drainage and gas production in steeply-dipping reservoirs. However, they omitted the influence of initial physical parameters of the reservoir, and rigorous mathematical analysis on the hydro-mechanical coupling effects is absent.

We explain the various impacts of gravity on permeability in both the updip and downdip parts of the reservoir with different inclinations by analyzing the drawdown and recovery times of permeability and the permeability differences in the updip and downdip reservoirs. With increasing inclination, the permeability difference between the updip and downdip reservoirs correspondingly amplifies. Previous studies have indicated that a greater inclination could result in greater pressure difference between the updip and downdip reservoirs, however, the rate of pressure drop across the entire reservoir has not been previously analyzed. This study indicates that when it is far from the production well, the pressure drop in the updip region of a shallow (<45°) reservoir tends to first increase then decrease as drainage and then gas production proceed. Conversely, the pressure drop tends to decrease continuously for steep seams (>45°). This results in a single peak in CH₄ production for shallow seams (<45°) but dual peaks for steep seams (>45°).
4.2. Well pattern optimization for steeply inclined reservoirs

In terms of the well layout, rectangular four-point well patterns are often adopted for horizontal or slightly inclined reservoirs. Reasonable spacings between neighboring wells are typically selected independent of reservoir dip angles. However, for steep reservoirs, the stress gradient resulting from gravity tends to dominate. The dip facilitates water transport and obstructs the gas from migrating to the drainage well within the updip part of the reservoir. The reverse effect is exerted on the water and gas within the downdip part of the reservoir. A larger well spacing along the dip of a more highly inclined reservoir results in more efficient water drainage and gas production. Often a greater burial depth leads to a lower initial permeability. The difference in permeability between the updip and downdip reservoirs within the influence range of a single well tends to be more distinct as the inclination increases. In addition, due to the asymmetric form of the pressure drop, this permeability difference also intensifies with the drainage process, which in turn exerts further impact on pressure drop and methane migration within the reservoirs. That is, methane productivity of a single well located in the updip reservoir is larger than that of a well in the downdip reservoir. The along-strike well spacing could be smaller for wells located in the downdip reservoir. Therefore, an inverted trapezoidal well pattern is recommended to facilitate the drainage and gas production of reservoirs with significant dip angles. In this way, the along-strike well spacing in the updip reservoir (a) is greater than that in the downdip reservoir (b) (Fig. 15). Thus, the well spacing along-dip (c) will increase correspondingly as the seam dip angle increases (Fig. 15). This recommendation is actually consistent with Ni et al.’s work. The inverted trapezoidal well pattern is proposed for CBM development in the anticline and syncline of the reservoir, which are inclined.

4.3. Shortcomings and prospect

Although we investigate the evolution of pressure, permeability and methane production in inclined reservoirs across a spectrum of dip angles (15°, 30°, 45°, 60°, and 75°), our coupled model is hampered by assumptions that the elastic modulus and other deformation parameters in the reservoir are constant during drainage and gas production. Experimental studies have shown that as the bedding inclination in the coal sample increases, the initial permeability declines due to the anisotropy of the coal sample. It has been confirmed that the horizontal permeability is often larger than that in the direction of the vertical bedding planes according to the field and laboratory study, and the max ratio of permeability in different directions of coal bedding plane could be 17:1. In addition, coal samples with different bedding angles also have different strength and deformation characteristics. Therefore, in order to more accurately investigate the evolution of permeability, reservoir pressure, and productivity of reservoirs with different dip angles, some subsequent work is needed. Firstly, for steeply inclined coal seams, permeability anisotropy plays an important role in determining the behavior of gas-water two-phase flow and assessing CBM productivity, which requires further study. Secondly, the relationship between coal stiffness and burial depth needs to be quantified in an improved model and must be included in the numerical calculation as initial parameters. Thirdly, changes in the fluid system within the reservoir due to water drainage could not only directly exert impact on coal mass stiffness and result in additional matrix deformation but also indirectly affect the reservoir stiffness and change the resulting geo-stress condition. Thus, future refinements include the need of an improved permeability coupling model involving the temporal and spatial evolution of the reservoir fluid system and geo-stress environment.

5. Conclusions

(1) The difference in the permeability ratio between the updip and downdip reservoirs intensifies with increasing dip angle. A greater reservoir inclination is more beneficial to gravity drainage in the updip reservoir, resulting in greater permeability difference within the updip reservoir. The permeability difference decreases as drainage and gas production proceeds in the updip reservoir, but increases with drainage and gas production in the downdip reservoir. However, the permeability difference in the entire reservoir also increases as gas production proceeds, indicating that the permeability changes more intensely in the downdip reservoir, which then dominates the permeability evolution of the entire reservoir.

(2) An apparent asymmetric distribution of reservoir pressures is identified for wells along-dip. The difference in reservoir pressure between the updip and downdip reservoirs intensifies as the dip angle increases, but lessens as drainage proceeds - the larger the seam dip angle, the smaller the final reservoir pressure. Due to the strengthening and weakening effects of gravity on dewatering within the updip and downdip reservoirs, respectively, the reservoir pressures of both the updip and downdip reservoirs decline rapidly in the initial stage of drainage. Following this, pressures fall slowly. Pressure reduction in the downdip reservoir is larger than that in the updip reservoir. However, reservoir pressure within the downdip limb of the seam is always larger than that within the updip limb.

(3) The evolution of gas content in reservoirs with different dip angles also exhibits different degrees of asymmetry at symmetrical locations in the updip and downdip reservoirs, which is clearly different from the symmetrical evolution of gas content in horizontal reservoirs. A steeper inclination leads to a higher CH₄ production rate. Gas production rate in a reservoir with an inclination of 75° is approximately 1-2 times that of a reservoir with a dip angle less than 60°. When the dip angle is < 45°, only a single peak in methane production rate exists and this transforms to twin-peaks as dip gradually increases from 45° to 75°. The occurrence of these twin-peaks is accelerated as the reservoir dip angle increases. The “dual-peak” feature has been observed from the daily gas production profiles of well group 15 and other 8 wells located in the west Fukang Block on the southern margin of
the Junggar Basin, Xinjiang Province. This validates the rationality of the model.

(4) The steeply-inclined reservoir results in large differences in physical properties of the updip reservoir and downdip reservoir, especially the permeability, reservoir pressure, and gas content. These changes cause the unsynchronized desorption of methane in the updip and downdip reservoirs. Methane in the updip reservoir desorbs preferentially over that in the downdip reservoir. The time gap in gas desorption between the updip and downdip reservoirs results in the “dual-peak” on the production profile. The first daily production peak mainly results from methane desorption in the updip reservoir, and methane desorption in the downdip reservoir contributed more to the second production peak.

(5) A larger well spacing along the dip of a more highly inclined reservoir results in more efficient water drainage and gas production. Due to the asymmetric evolution of permeability, reservoir pressure and gas content, methane productivity of a single well located in the updip reservoir is larger than that of a well in the downdip reservoir. Thus, an inverted trapezoidal well pattern is recommended to facilitate the drainage and gas production of reservoirs with significant dip angles. The along-strike well spacing in the updip reservoir is greater than that in the downdip reservoir. The well spacing along-dip increases correspondingly as the seam dip angle grows.
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Nomenclature

\( \varepsilon_{ki} \) strain tensor
\( G \) shear modulus
\( D \) effective elastic modulus
\( E \) Young’s modulus of the coal
\( \nu \) Poisson’s ratio of coal
\( \sigma_{ki} \) component of the total stress tensor
\( \sigma_n \) normal stress component
\( K \) bulk modulus of the coal
\( K_g \) bulk modulus of the coal grains
\( L_n \) the width of the matrix
\( L_f \) the aperture of fracture
\( K_n \) normal stiffness of fracture
\( K_f \) modified fracture stiffness
\( \varepsilon_s \) volume strain within the matrix
\( \varepsilon_l \) Langmuir-type strain coefficient
\( p_l \) Langmuir gas pressure constant
\( p_{\text{gas}} \) gas pressure in the matrix
\( p_{\text{fr}} \) gas pressure in the fractures
\( p_{\text{fw}} \) water pressure in the fractures
\( p_f \) the total fluid pressure within the fractures
\( s_w \) water phase saturation, \( S_g + S_w = 1 \)
\( s_g \) gas phase saturation
\( p_c \) pumping negative pressure
\( u_k \) displacement in the k-direction
\( F_k \) body force in the k-direction
\( m_g \) mass of gas in the matrix
\( M_g \) molar mass of methane
\( R \) the molar constant of methane
\( T \) temperature of coal reservoir
\( D_i \) gas diffusion coefficient
\( L_c \) cleat spacing
\( \rho_s \) density of the coal matrix
\( T_s \) reservoir temperature under standard conditions
\( p_s \) standard atmospheric pressure
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