

Introduction

Shale reservoirs, characterized by their extensive nanopore networks and heterogeneous pore structures, hold significant promise for CO₂ sequestration. This study investigates the storage and sequestration potential of shales from two formations: the Lower Silurian Longmaxi Formation (TY1) and the Lower Cambrian Niutitang Formation (N206). A comprehensive suite of methods, including XRD analysis, mercury intrusion porosimetry (MIP), low-pressure gas adsorption (N₂ and CO₂), field-emission scanning electron microscopy (FE-SEM), fractal and multifractal analysis was employed to characterize pore structure, adsorption behavior, and mineralogical controls on CO₂ storage.

2. Mineralogy and SEM Morphology



Figure 2. Authigenic quartz and clays supporting OM-hosted pores: TY1, (a) and (b); N206, (c) and (d).

Bo Li^{a,b}, Bingsong Yu^a, Paul W.J. Glover^b, Piroska Lorinczi^b, Kejian Wu^c, Ciprian Panaitescu^c,



adsorption isotherms for (f) N206 and (h) TY1.

- (1) Ou, C. & You, Z. Review of CO 2 utilization and storage in adsorption-type unconventional natural gas reservoirs. Fuel 374 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2024.132352 (2) Bo Li, Ciprian-Theodor Panaitescu, Paul W J Glover, et al. Unravelling 3D Succolarity to Quantify Multiscale Petrophysical and Structural Properties of Porous Media. ESS Open Archive
- (3) Wang, L. et al. Differential mineral diagenetic evolution of lacustrine shale: Implications for CO2 storage. International Journal of Coal Geology 295 (2024). (4) Wang, D. et al. Difference between of coal and shale pore structural characters based on gas adsorption experiment and multifractal analysis. Fuel 371 (2024).
- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2024.132044
- 2018;219:296-311

Figure 5. OM-hosted pores comparison: TY1, (a) and (b); N206, (c) and (d).

(5) Liu K, Ostadhassan M, Zou J, Gentzis T, Rezaee R, Bubach B, et al. Multifractal analysis of gas adsorption isotherms for pore structure characterization of the Bakken Shale. Fuel