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ABSTRACT
Accurate shale volume estimation is an important approach in reservoirs characterization as it forms the basis upon which evaluators can ascertain the hydrocarbon content of the reservoirs. The porosity, gamma ray, neutron-density and deep induction logs data were used to arrive at suitable shale volume estimates of the field studied. Analysis of well logs data was done using the TECHLOG Exploration software. Delineation of reservoirs was carried out with OpendTect software. The Microsoft excel spreadsheet was utilized to accurately estimate other suitable petrophysical parameters such as the permeability, water saturation, hydrocarbon saturation and the porosity. Three different non-linear shale volume models, the Larionov, the Steiber and the Clavier models were used to determine the reservoirs’ shale content across three wells of Yewa reservoirs characterized by varying thicknesses. Variation in the depths down hole for each of the methods revealed that shale volume estimates with the Larionov model was determined across thickness 142.646 m with top and bottom depths of 1907.057 m in well Y1, 1920.312 m and 2068.068 m in well Y2 and 2078.812 m and 2268.442 m in well Y3 and the one with Steiber model were respectively determined across thicknesses 146.456 m, 147.752 m and 150.658 m for Y1, Y2 and Y3 reservoirs, and top and bottom depths of 1947.571 m and 2033.219 m in well Y1, 2041.754 m and 2136.851 m in well Y2 and 2144.979 m and 2266.442 m in well Y3 and the one with Clavier model were respectively determined across thicknesses 85.649 m, 95.098 m and 121.371 m for Y1, Y2 and Y3 reservoirs, and top and bottom depths of 1947.571 m and 2033.219 m in well Y1, 2041.754 m and 2136.851 m in well Y2 and 2144.979 m and 2266.442 m in well Y3 and the one with Clavier model were respectively determined across thicknesses 146.456 m, 147.752 m and 94.869 m for Y1, Y2 and Y3 reservoirs and top and bottom depths of 1700.601 m and 1907.087 m in well Y1, 1920.312 m and 2068.368 m in well Y2 and 2078.812 m and 2173.681 m in well Y3. The lowest shale volume average estimate was recorded from the Larionov model. Nevertheless, one cannot conclude that the Larionov model is the most reliable as values obtained may be because of instability in the sensitivities of utilized well logs and the complexities inherent in the properties of wells down hole. A further investigation of the sensitivities of the well logs and the down hole properties of the wells showed that the Larionov method gives reasonable, consistent, and repetitive intervals when compared with the Steiber and the Clavier models. The Larionov model is hereby recommended for use in the study area.

INTRODUCTION
Well logs are two-dimensional plots revealing various values of petrophysical parameters against corresponding depth and presented in signatures which can be interpreted (Shaaban and Ahmed, 2014). Well logs interpretation is very critical in accurately estimating petrophysical parameters such as shale volume (Vsh), water saturation (Sw), hydrocarbon saturation (Sth), porosity (Φ) (Zhao et al., 2016). Shale is made up of gravey, fine, broken sediment revealing high potential of fissility and composed of sticky soft, thin, flat smooth matters. Shale is composed of six percent feldspars, two percent iron oxide, five percent trioxygen carbonate minerals, twenty-eight percent quartz and fifty-eight percent clay (Adepehin et al., 2022). The shale volume is one of the most fundamental and basic...
reservoirs properties that are needed to clearly determine the actual shale content in the hydrocarbon (HC) reservoirs (Adepehin et al., 2022). This is very essential in estimating accurately, other geophysical (petrophysical) parameters such as water saturation, effective porosity, permeability and Net to Gross thickness which are instrumental and germane in determining the (hydrocarbon) HC potential, quality of reservoirs and realistic estimation of HC reserves (Omoja and Obiekezie, 2021). Estimation of the reservoir shale volume can be done with different models which have been well explained in literatures. The (Larionov, 1969), the (Steiber, 1970) and (the Clavier et al., 1971) models were used to estimate the reservoir shale volume across different thicknesses down hole. Generally, Shale volume is estimated utilizing the γ-rays logs, as they are direct measurements of reservoir shale radioactive content (Al-Azazi and Albaroot 2022). This doesn’t imply that other well logs signatures do not show records of the existence of shale, it only means that they cannot be easily interpreted as the ones done with only γ-rays logs (Boldyrev et al., 2022). The Niger Delta basin is highly rich in petroliferous products. It is made up of spacious source rocks which are capable of harboring hydrocarbon and other reservoir fluids (Adepehin et al., 2022). The Niger Delta reservoirs are majorly characterized by high volume of petroliferous crudes which are recoverable with engineering techniques that best suit the field of study (Avbovbo, 1978). There exist reasonable deposits of hydrocarbon that can be commercialized in the Niger Delta basin and an accurate estimation of the shale volume will no doubt assist in making reasonable decisions before exploration (Ejedawe, 1981). Estimation of the \( V_{sh} \) is an important step in evaluating a formation. It is the ratio of the total quantity of clay alongside other particles (silt) to the entire volume of rock (Al-Azazi and Albaroot 2022). Shale exists in three different forms in a formation (Igbal and Rezaee, 2020). They occur as particles dispersed in the pores or laminated particles in the layers or minerals contained in the structural matrix of the rocks. Stratified formations are made up of different quantity of shale. Theoretically, shale volume estimate falls within 0 to 1 or 0 to 100% (Igbal and Rezaee, 2020). Kamel and Mabrouk, (2003) developed an equation for estimating the shale volume from the porosity logs examples of which include acoustic, density and neutron logs. The developed equation is based on different parameters made accessible from the logs (Kamel and Mabrouk, 2003). Some of these parameters are the matrix effects, the fluid nature and the inherent shaly parameters. Shale presence in reservoirs with permeable rocks, if not accurately computed will result to wrong estimation of the acoustic or neutron porosity and this can as well result to wrong behaviors of other logs (Baiyegunhi et al., 2022). Many log-originated shaliness are now being employed to determine shaliness estimated from information provided from one or more than one well (Baiyegunhi et al., 2022). The use of more than one shaliness indicator often time yields reliable shale volume estimate when compared to when a single indicator is used (Baiyegunhi et al., 2022). Every used indicator is capable of giving the actual or the upper limit of the value of the shale content. The least value of this limit is most time taken as the actual value of the shale volume, although other factors may be responsible for the decrease in the estimated value but this may be corrected with another non-linear approach of shale volume estimation (Ejihe and Ideozu, 2018). Reservoir rocks can be said to be clean if the shale volume is less than 10%. If the shale volume is greater than 10% but less than 34%, the rocks can be termed shaly (containing some quantities of shale), Shale volume up to or greater than 34% reveals a pure shale formation (Szabo et al., 2021). Knowing the volume of shale will help the reservoirs analysts to correctly predict other petrophysical parameters which are also important in ranking a reservoir (Pandey et al., 2020). Adequate knowledge of the shale content of a reservoir also assists in accurate assessment of the quality of the rocks and this will in turn determine the hydrocarbon content of the reservoir (Pandey et al., 2020). Data obtained from the neutron-density, resistivity and spontaneous logs can be employed in estimating the volume of shale but the γ-ray log has overtime been used and it has stood out among other methods of estimating the reservoir \( V_{sh} \) (Kamayou et al., 2021). When two or more non-linear shale volume estimation models are compared, it is normal to experience one out of the models which stands out in terms of producing low, consistent and reliable estimates which best suit the study area (Kamayou et al., 2021). This can be determined by first interpreting the well logs and then employs the interpretation to estimate the shale volume. The linear approach works on the assumption that only clay and shale minerals are contained in the formation (Zagana et al., 2022). The assumption on which the linear shale volume approach works often time overestimate the reservoir shale volume in areas which are also composed of other inherent radioactive materials (Szabo and Dobroka, 2013). The (Larionov, 1969), the (Steiber, 1970) and the (Clavier et al., 1971) methods are non-linear approaches well defined for particular ages of formation and geographical locations. Based on the peculiarity of the study area, these models are well designed to mitigate the deficiencies inherent in the linear approach. It is right to mention that the Larionov, 1969 model stood out among the non-linear methods of estimating the reservoir shale volume because it gives the lowest, comparable and consistent estimates when compared to the Steiber, 1970 and the Clavier et al., 1971 models. Although, the Larionov, 1969, the Steiber, 1970 and the Clavier et al., 1971 models are all still accompanied by traces of radioactive contents inherent in the chemical build-up of the reservoirs which can unconsciously make evaluators overrate the reservoirs, nevertheless, errors inherent in them cannot be compared to that of the linear method. The lowest value recorded with the Larionov, 1969 model doesn’t translate to the approach being the most reliable as values may be as a result logs sensitivities fluctuation. The three non-linear models depend on the
estimated $I_{GR}$ originating from the linear approach. The usual practice of utilizing the most reliable $\gamma$-ray log of the area under study for $I_{GR}$ estimation is usually accompanied by very high level of errors and uncertainties. Overtime in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, exploration processes have been done first by having an in-depth knowledge of the reservoir $V_{sh}$ but these estimations have been accompanied by various uncertainties and irregularities due to radioactive elements (minerals) in the formation and so there’s an urgent need for a method that will minimize or totally eradicate the uncertainties. This research work seeks to compare three non-linear models “the Larionov, 1969, the Steiber, 1970 and the Clavier et al., 1971” models of estimating the shale volume using well log data from “Yewa” field, Niger Delta, Nigeria and predict the most reliable and consistent model based on stable sensitivities of the well logs in the study area. Findings of this work will assist reservoirs engineers and evaluators to better assess reservoirs before taking decisions on exploration.

Study Area
The study area is a basin located in the Niger Delta. The identified field “Yewa” occurs within respective latitudes and longitudes ($5^\circ49'N$ and $6^\circ78'N$) and ($6^\circ59'E$ and $6^\circ66'E$). Figures 1 and 2 show the geology and map of the studied location respectively. The geology of the subsurface of the location clearly shows that of hydrocarbon zone located in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria (Asubiojo and Okunuwadje, 2016). Well bored in the location enhances the procurement of geophysical wireline well logs used for this research (Aigbadon et al., 2022). The Niger Delta is a basin which is majorly characterized by clastic stratified deposits which can be traced to formation from the recent Eocene through the evolution of the Paleocene to the evolution of the early Pre-santonian depression (Aigbadon et al., 2022). The Niger Delta stratigraphy comprises of the Akata, Agbada and the Benin formations which are respectively made up of potential source rocks, reservoirs at certain depth in water and minor quantity of silt and shale, sequences alternated by partly sandstones and partly shale, dividing-channels and deltaic originating plains and gravels and sand (Iheaturu et al., 2022).

**Figure 1:** Niger Delta Litho-stratigraphy

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**
Three wells Y1, Y2 and Y3 in Yewa field were identified and seven different types of geophysical logs which include the caliper, sonic, spontaneous potential, resistivity, neutron, density and gamma ray logs were utilized for this research (Table 1). TECHLOG Exploration software and Microsoft excel spreadsheet were utilized for the analysis of data. Reservoirs’ delineation was done with the OpendTect software to eliminate wrong or null values.
The lithology was identified to distinguish between the shale and sand bodies. The $\gamma$-ray log was employed to determine the shale volume. The shale volume computation was done across the intervals mapped out in Yewa reservoirs with three non-linear models. These are the Larionov, the Steiber and the Clavier models. The three non-linear models were chosen based on the peculiarity of the study area and the fact that they do not assume that the formation contained only clay and shale minerals but rather mitigate the deficiencies inherent in the linear models. Despite the long year these models have been invented, they proved to be more effective in the study area and this explains why they were adopted for this study. The $\gamma$-ray index ($I_{GR}$) for clean and tertiary reservoir rocks were estimated as their values will be required to estimate the shale volume. The relation shown in equation 1 is used to estimate the gamma $\gamma$-ray index (Al-Azazi and Albaroot 2022).

$$I_{GR} = \frac{\gamma_{ray \text{ reading}} - \gamma_{ray \text{ matrix}}}{\gamma_{ray \text{ shale}} - \gamma_{ray \text{ matrix}}}$$ (1)

Where,

$I_{GR} = \gamma_{ray \text{ index}}$

$\gamma_{ray \text{ reading}} = \gamma_{ray \text{ reading}} \text{ (log reading)}$

$\gamma_{ray \text{ shale}} = \gamma_{ray \text{ reading in a formation of (100%) shaliness}}$

$\gamma_{ray \text{ matrix}} = \gamma_{ray \text{ reading in a formation of (100%) clean rock}}$

**Estimation of Volume of Reservoir Shale**

Records from research show that Niger Delta hydrocarbon reservoirs are majorly sand from the Agbada formation. Nevertheless, some elements of shale deposits still exist alongside the dominant sandstones (Mode et al., 2013). This little element of shaliness has the ability to determine the hydrocarbon content of the reservoirs significantly (Mkinga et al., 2020). The shale volume is estimated from the three aforementioned models as follows:

Larionov model of 1969

$$V_{sh,Larionov} = 0.083(13I_{GR} - 1)$$ (2)

Steiber model of 1970

$$V_{sh,Steiber} = \frac{\gamma_{ray \text{ Index}}}{3 - (2\gamma_{ray \text{ Index}})}$$ (3)
**Clavier et al model of 1971**

\[
V_{sh_{Clavier et al}} = \sqrt{1.7(3.38 - (I_{GR} - 0.7)^2}
\]  

Where,

\[
V_{sh_{Larionov}} = \text{Larionov shale volume for tertiary rock}
\]

\[
V_{sh_{Steiber}} = \text{Steiber shale volume for tertiary rocks}
\]

\[
V_{sh_{Clavier et al}} = \text{Clavier et al shale volume for tertiary}
\]

\[
I_{GR} = \text{\(\gamma\) - ray Index}
\]

**The Non-Linear and the Linear Shale Volume Estimation**

The non-linear shale volume estimation models such as the Larionov, the Steiber, and the Clavier et al models are meant for particular geographical characteristics which are also common in the study area. These models respond only to a particular age of rocks in the formation. The linear approach is designed not for particular geographical prevalent characteristics but rather for all existing characteristics of the formation. The prevalent radioactive characteristics in the formation is one of the reasons, the non-linear approach gives lower \(V_{sh}\) than the linear approach (Adepehin et al., 2022). Nevertheless, the two methods require \(\gamma\)-ray response across a planned depth down hole and determination of \(\gamma\) – ray index \((I_{GR})\) for reservoirs with clean rocks with no traces of shale and that of 100% shale zones (Pico and Salina, 2017).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Five potential reservoirs were identified from each of the Yewa wells, Y1, Y2 and Y3 all of which were respectively labeled as RSV1, RSV2, RSV3, RSV4 and RSV5. Analysis of the five mapped out reservoirs was done using geophysical well logs. All the five identified reservoirs RSV1, RSV2, RSV3, RSV4 and RSV5 were correlated across all the three Yewa wells, Y1, Y2 and Y3. Each of the shale volume estimation models were tested across varying thickness in each of Y1, Y2 and Y3. The Larionov, the Steiber and the Clavier models were respectively examined across the thicknesses of \((142.646\ m, 90.678\ m\ and\ 107.290\ m), (85.649\ m, 95.098\ m\ and\ 121.371\ m)\) and \((146.456\ \ m, 147.752\ \ m\ and\ 94.869\ \ m)\) for Y1, Y2 and Y3 wells. The variation in the thicknesses at which these models were examined was to determine the consistency of each of them, so as to take decision on which of them best suit the area studied. The reservoirs thicknesses for all the wells were determined by subtracting the top from the bottom. Table 2 shows the reservoirs thicknesses across Y1, Y2 and Y3 wells. Figure 3 shows geophysical log correlation across all the wells.

**Table 2: Variation in Reservoirs Thickness Across the Wells for All the Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Larionov model</th>
<th>Steiber model</th>
<th>Clavier model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Top</td>
<td>1946.605</td>
<td>1947.571</td>
<td>1760.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>2089.252</td>
<td>2033.219</td>
<td>1907.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>142.646</td>
<td>85.649</td>
<td>146.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>Top</td>
<td>2164.690</td>
<td>2041.754</td>
<td>1920.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>2255.368</td>
<td>2136.851</td>
<td>2068.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>90.678</td>
<td>95.098</td>
<td>147.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>Top</td>
<td>2303.374</td>
<td>2144.979</td>
<td>2078.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>2410.663</td>
<td>2266.442</td>
<td>2173.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>107.290</td>
<td>121.371</td>
<td>94.869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Geophysical log correlation across all the wells.**
Discussion on the Reservoir Shale Volume

Table 3, 4 and 5 show the reservoirs shale volume obtained respectively with the Larionov, Steiber, and Clavier models. There is an increase of shale as depth increases in Yewa field. This is in line with the research done by *(Kamayou et al., 2021)*. The formation of Agbada in the Niger Delta was described as shale-sand intercalation. The Larionov model of shale volume estimation gives the lowest in tables 3, 4 and 5. The Gamma-ray index is denoted by (IGR) and the unit of measurement of shale volume - voids per volume is denoted by (v/v)

Table 3: Shale Volume from the Larionov, the Steiber and the Clavier Estimation Models Yewa 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>IGR (v/v)</th>
<th>Larionov $V_a$ (v/v)</th>
<th>Steiber $V_s$ (v/v)</th>
<th>Clavier $V_{cl}$ (v/v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSV 1</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 2</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 3</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 4</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 5</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 5 and 6 show that the Larionov model of shale volume estimation gives lower and consistent estimate when compared to the Steiber and the Clavier models. The Steiber estimation model produced estimates higher than that of the Larionov but less than that of the Clavier. It is worthy to mention that the use of other estimation models apart from the Larionov model in the study area is likely to overrate the shale content of the reservoirs and this can as well affect the judgments of reservoirs engineers in ranking the reservoirs for the production of hydrocarbon. This is in line with the work of *(Kamayou et al., 2021)*. The work was based on estimating the volume of shale using different estimation models across different reservoir thicknesses in a field of Niger Delta known as VIA. They however concluded that the Larionov estimation model is the best for use in the area studied.
Nosrati et al. (2014) estimated the shale volume using the combination of sonic, density and neutron logs in a trioxocarbonate succession. Results obtained from (Nosrati et al., 2014), further showed that the γ-ray log method gives a more reasonable value when compared to that of the porosity log.

Adepehin et al. (2022) worked on the effect of shale volume on the hydrocarbon potential of Green field in Niger Delta using geophysical well logs. The Green field is however concluded to be high in hydrocarbon as the shale volumes for all the five identified reservoirs were discovered to be very low.

Table 4: Shale Volume from the Larionov, the Steiber and the Clavier Estimation Models Yewa 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>IGR (v/v)</th>
<th>Larionov $V_{sh}$ (v/v)</th>
<th>Steiber $V_{sh}$ (v/v)</th>
<th>Clavier $V_{sh}$ (v/v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSV 1</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 2</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 3</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 4</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 5</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Shale Volume from the Larionov, the Steiber and the Clavier Estimation Models Yewa 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>IGR (v/v)</th>
<th>Larionov $V_{sh}$ (v/v)</th>
<th>Steiber $V_{sh}$ (v/v)</th>
<th>Clavier $V_{sh}$ (v/v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSV 1</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 2</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 3</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 4</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV 5</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9: Comparison of Shale Volume Estimation Models in Yewa 3

Figure 10: Relationship Between the Larionov, the Steiber and the Clavier Vsh Models in Yewa3

Similar to Yewa 1 and 2 in figure 9 and 10, Yewa 3 produces shale volume estimate that is highest with the Clavier model, higher with the Steiber model and lowest with the Larionov model. The Larionov (Non-linear) model gives estimates that range from 0.004 v/v to 0.0085 v/v for all the Yewa 3 reservoirs. The Steiber shale volume estimation model produces values ranging from 0.0065 v/v to 0.0145 v/v for all the Yewa 3 reservoirs. The Clavier estimation model gives the highest shale volume estimates which range from 0.0085 v/v to 0.018 v/v for all the Yewa 3 reservoirs. The Clavier estimation model gives the highest shale volume estimates which range from 0.0085 v/v to 0.018 v/v for all the Yewa 3 reservoirs. The Larionov estimation model gives the lowest, consistent and repetitive shale volume when compared to the other two. This is because of the peculiarity of the study area and the reasonable values obtained from the model. Petrophysically, the Yewa reservoirs have substantial hydrocarbon deposits in the subsurface porespaces and the producibility determinants are reasonable enough to facilitate secondary migration of these deposits into the borehole, if improved upon.

Results obtained from this work show that the Larionov (Non-linear) estimation model eradicates the uncertainties common with the linear model and gives the lowest estimates for RSV 1, RSV 2, RSV 3, RSV 4 and RSV 5 in Yewa 1, Yewa 2 and Yewa 3 reservoirs. As low shale volume estimate is a clear indication of high porosity, permeability and hydrocarbon content, the Larionov (Non-linear) model is however recommended for use in the area studied.
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