

# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Resumen</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Resum</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation and Objectives . . . . .	1
1.2 Thesis Organization . . . . .	5
<b>2 Forward Simulators</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Flow and Transport Problems . . . . .	8
2.2 Multi-scale-oriented Flow Simulator . . . . .	9
2.2.1 Flow difference equation . . . . .	9
2.2.2 Well flow-rate . . . . .	14
2.2.3 Velocity fields . . . . .	16
2.3 Multi-scale-oriented Transport Simulator . . . . .	17
<b>3 A Multi-scale Blocking McMC Method: 1. Methodology</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	22
3.2 Blocking McMC Methods . . . . .	24
3.2.1 Bayesian formulation . . . . .	25
3.2.2 Markov chain Monte Carlo method . . . . .	26
3.2.3 Single-component McMC method . . . . .	26
3.2.4 Blocking McMC methods . . . . .	27
3.2.5 Generation of the proposal kernel . . . . .	30
3.2.6 Multi-scale computation of the likelihood . . . . .	31
3.3 Sensitivity Analysis . . . . .	33
3.3.1 A synthetic example . . . . .	33
3.3.2 Convergence velocity . . . . .	35
3.3.3 McMC estimation performance . . . . .	36

3.3.4	Sampling efficiency . . . . .	41
3.4	Coupled Multi-scale BMcMC Methods . . . . .	42
3.4.1	Scheme #4 . . . . .	42
3.4.2	Scheme #5 . . . . .	43
3.5	Conclusions and Discussions . . . . .	45
<b>4</b>	<b>A Multi-scale Blocking McMC Method: 2. Uncertainty Assessment</b>	<b>47</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	48
4.2	A Synthetic Example . . . . .	52
4.2.1	Reference model and conditioning data set . . . . .	52
4.2.2	An inverse-conditional estimate . . . . .	54
4.3	Uncertainty Assessment . . . . .	59
4.3.1	Model uncertainty . . . . .	59
4.3.2	Uncertainty of model responses . . . . .	60
4.3.3	Macrodispersion . . . . .	61
4.4	A Synthetic Experiment . . . . .	63
4.4.1	Experimental configurations . . . . .	64
4.4.2	Model uncertainty . . . . .	65
4.4.3	Response uncertainty . . . . .	70
4.4.4	Uncertainty propagation . . . . .	75
4.5	Conclusions and Discussions . . . . .	78
<b>5</b>	<b>Does Model Structure Preservation not Matter? A Comparison on Two Methods for Inverse Stochastic Modeling</b>	<b>81</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	82
5.2	Methodology . . . . .	83
5.2.1	Blocking McMC method . . . . .	84
5.2.2	Ensemble Kalman filtering . . . . .	87
5.3	Case Study 1 . . . . .	90
5.3.1	Experimental configuration . . . . .	90
5.3.2	Inverse-conditional modeling by EnKF . . . . .	91
5.3.3	Inverse-conditional modeling by BMcMC . . . . .	95
5.3.4	Uncertainty assessment . . . . .	95
5.4	Case Study 2 . . . . .	99
5.4.1	Experimental configuration . . . . .	99
5.4.2	Inverse-conditional modeling by EnKF . . . . .	100
5.4.3	Inverse-conditional modeling by BMcMC . . . . .	101
5.4.4	Uncertainty assessment . . . . .	101
5.5	Discussions and Conclusions . . . . .	105

<i>CONTENTS</i>	xiii
<b>6 Conclusions and Suggestions</b>	<b>109</b>
6.1 Summary . . . . .	109
6.2 Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	111
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>A An LU-decomposition-based Sampler</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>B An FFT-based Sampler</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>127</b>