Report for the semester thesis "Development of a Monte Carlo algorithm for optimal control problems"

Stefano Weidmann
Institute of Fluid Dynamics
ETH Zurich
Zurich, Switzerland
stefanow@student.ethz.ch

***Abstract*—The Monte-Carlo adjoint algorithm described in [1] has been applied to a variant of the *quarter five spot configuration* found in petroleum engineering literature [2]. Results have been unsatisfactory due to lack of an appropriate preconditioner.**

I. Introduction

This report aims to apply the Monte-Carlo adjoint algorithm described in [1] to a variant of problem known as *quarter five spot configuration* in petroleum engineering literature [2]. The set up is described in section II. Numerical experiments and a discussion follow in section IV. Derivatives needed for the implementation of the Monte-Carlo adjoint algorithm are given in the appendix in subsection B.

The main advantage of the Monte-Carlo adjoint algorithm in comparison to the better known *checkpointing* scheme proposed by Griewank and Walter [3] lies in its forward-in-time nature. Instead of having to store or recompute solutions, the adjoint equation can be solved in lockstep with the forward one. In principle, it is an application of the classic Monte-Carlo linear solver developed in [4] applied to the adjoint linear system of equations.

II. Problem description

We model a cross section of an oil field as a two dimensional square $\Omega := [0,1]^2$. In the field, there are two phases: water and oil. At the lower left corner $\boldsymbol{x}_{\text{drill}} := (0,0)$, we know the pressure $p_{\text{drill}}(t)$. Opposite of that, at $\boldsymbol{x}_{\text{well}} := (1,1)$ a well is located. There we can measure the pressure $p_{\text{well}}(t)$ as well as the total volumetric outflow

$$Q_{\text{tot}}(t) := Q_{\text{o}}(t) + Q_{\text{w}}(t)$$

per unit depth.

The flow rates for both phases are described by Darcy's law

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{w}} = -\frac{k k_{\text{rel, w}}}{\mu_{\text{w}}} \operatorname{grad}(p), \tag{1}$$

for water and

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{o}} = -\frac{k k_{\text{rel, o}}}{\mu_{\text{o}}} \operatorname{grad}(p) \tag{2}$$

for oil. Here, $p(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ is the pressure, μ_{o}, μ_{w} are dynamic viscosities for oil and water, $k(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ is the permeability. $k_{\text{rel, o}}(S)$, $k_{\text{rel, w}}(S)$ are relative permeabilities and are assumed to depend quadratically on the saturation of water $S_{\text{w}} \in [0,1]$ and the saturation of oil $S_{\text{o}} \in [0,1]$:

$$k_{\text{rel, o}} = S_{\text{o}}^2 \tag{3}$$

$$k_{\text{rel, w}} = S_{\text{w}}^2. \tag{4}$$

The saturations are linked by the constitutive relation

$$S_{\text{o}} + S_{\text{w}} = 1. \tag{5}$$

$\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{o}}(\boldsymbol{x},t)$, $\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{w}}(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ finally are the volumetric flow rates per unit area (Darcy velocities).

The saturation S is not assumed constant but instead is transported according to the equation

$$\phi \frac{\partial}{\partial t} S_{\text{w}} + \operatorname{div}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{w}}) = q_{\text{w}}. \tag{6}$$

The term

$$q_{\text{w}} := Q_{\text{w}} \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_{\text{well}}) \tag{7}$$

describes a line sink of water located at the well. Similarly, we use

$$q_{\text{o}} := Q_{\text{o}} \delta(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_{\text{well}}) \tag{8}$$

$$q_{\text{tot}} := q_{\text{o}} + q_{\text{w}}. \tag{9}$$

ϕ is the porosity of the rock which is assumed to be constant over the domain.

Conservation of the total mass then reads

$$\operatorname{div}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}}) = q_{\text{tot}}, \tag{10}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}} := \boldsymbol{v}_{\text{o}} + \boldsymbol{v}_{\text{w}} \tag{11}$$

is the total Darcy velocity.

We then introduce the mobilities

$$\lambda_{\text{o}} := \frac{k k_{\text{rel, o}}}{\mu_{\text{o}}} \tag{12}$$

$$\lambda_{\text{w}} := \frac{k k_{\text{rel, w}}}{\mu_{\text{w}}} \tag{13}$$

$$\lambda_{\text{tot}} := \lambda_{\text{o}} + \lambda_{\text{w}}. \tag{14}$$

Substituting in the λ from (12) into Darcy's law (2), (1) and adding both sides of the results we get the total Darcy's law

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}} = -\lambda_{\text{tot}} \operatorname{grad}(p). \tag{15}$$

Plugging this (15) into the conservation of mass (10) leads to the pressure equation

$$\boxed{\operatorname{div}(\lambda_{\text{tot}} \operatorname{grad}(p)) = -q_{\text{tot}}.} \tag{16}$$

Comparing the total Darcy's law (15) and the Darcy's law for water (1), we see that

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{w}} = \frac{\lambda_{\text{w}}}{\lambda_{\text{tot}}} \boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}}. \tag{17}$$

We then plug in the model for the relative permeabilities in terms of the saturations (3), to get the final for of saturation transport equation

$$\boxed{\frac{\partial}{\partial t} S_{\text{w}} + \operatorname{div}\left(f(S_{\text{w}}) \boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}}\right) = \frac{q_{\text{w}}}{\phi},} \tag{18}$$

where f is the flux function

$$\boxed{f(S_{\text{w}}) := \frac{S_{\text{w}}^2/\phi}{S_{\text{w}}^2 + (1 - S_{\text{w}})^2 \mu_{\text{w}}/\mu_{\text{o}}}.} \tag{19}$$

A. Boundary and initial conditions

We assume the initial saturation of water to be given, which is $S_{\text{w}}(\boldsymbol{x}, 0)$. For the pressure equation we use homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions (no flow), i.e.

$$\operatorname{grad}(p) = p_0 \begin{pmatrix} \delta(x - x_w) \\ \delta(y - y_w), \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

where we choose p_0 such that the compatibility condition

$$\int_\Omega q_{\text{tot}} \mathrm{d}A \overset{!}{=} \int_{\partial\Omega} \lambda_{\text{tot}} \operatorname{grad}(p)^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{n} \mathrm{d}l \tag{21}$$

is satisfied.

B. What to optimize?

To test the Monte-Carlo adjoint method, we want to match the pressure difference between drill and well, which is

$$c(T) := \int_0^T \left(\left(p_{\text{drill}}(t) - p_{\text{well}}(t) \right) - \left(\tilde{p}_{\text{drill}}(t) - \tilde{p}_{\text{well}}(t) \right) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}t, \tag{22}$$

where the variables with a tilde denote computed quantities and T is a final time.

C. What do we control?

We control the log-permeabilities $\ln(k)$, as these are hard to measure.

III. Discretization

We discretize the square domain Ω with $n \times n$ square finite volumes, thus getting a mesh width of $h := 1/n$.

An overview of the discretization technique is given in the following procedure:

1) Solve the pressure equation (16) as detailed in subsection III-A
2) Compute the total Darcy velocity as in (15), using the same approximation of the gradient as in the first step
3) Solve the saturation equation (18) as in subsection III-B
4) Update the relative permeabilities according to (3) and repeat

A. Discretizing the pressure Poisson equation

Averaging the pressure Poisson equation (16) over such a finite volume K, and using the divergence theorem leads to

$$\frac{1}{h^2} \int_{\partial K} \lambda_{\text{tot}} \operatorname{grad}(p)^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{n} \mathrm{d}l = -\frac{1}{h^2} \int_K q_{\text{tot}} \mathrm{d}A. \tag{23}$$

Using the four boundaries North, East, South and West of the finite volume K, we approximate (23) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{h} \Bigg((\lambda_{\text{tot}} \frac{\delta}{\delta x} p)|_{\text{E}} - (\lambda_{\text{tot}} \frac{\delta}{\delta x} p)|_{\text{W}} \\ &\qquad\qquad + (\lambda_{\text{tot}} \frac{\delta}{\delta y} p)|_{\text{N}} - \frac{\delta}{\delta y} p)|_{\text{S}} \Bigg) \\ &= -\frac{Q_{\text{tot}}}{h^2} \cdot \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } K \text{ is the finite volume nearest to the well} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

$\frac{\delta}{\delta \cdot}$ denote the standard finite difference quotients, i.e.

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta x} p|_{\text{E}} = \frac{1}{h}(p_R - p_K) \tag{25}$$
$$\frac{\delta}{\delta x} p|_{\text{W}} = \frac{1}{h}(p_K - p_D) \tag{26}$$
$$\frac{\delta}{\delta y} p|_{\text{N}} = \frac{1}{h}(p_U - p_K) \tag{27}$$
$$\frac{\delta}{\delta y} p|_{\text{S}} = \frac{1}{h}(p_K - p_D). \tag{28}$$

Here, U stands for the upper neighbor of K, D for the lower (down), R for the right and L for the left. p_K is the pressure at the center of the volume, which is taken to be the same as the volume averaged $\bar{p}$, as our scheme is just first order.

The total mobilities λ_{tot} at the boundaries are approximated by the harmonic mean of the total mobilities inside the adjacent finite volumes as

$$\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_{\text{E}} \approx \operatorname{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}|_R) \tag{29}$$
$$\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_{\text{W}} \approx \operatorname{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}|_L) \tag{30}$$
$$\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_{\text{N}} \approx \operatorname{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}|_U) \tag{31}$$
$$\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_{\text{S}} \approx \operatorname{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}|_D), \tag{32}$$

where

$$\operatorname{hm}(a, b) = 2ab/(a + b). \tag{33}$$

Explain why the harmonic mean

The discretized pressure Poisson equation reads

$$\begin{aligned} &T_E(p_K - p_R) + T_W(p_K - p_L) \\ &\qquad + T_N(p_K - p_U) + T_S(p_K - p_D) \\ &= Q_{\text{tot}} \cdot \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } K \text{ is the finite volume nearest to the well} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where

$$T_N = \mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}|_U), \tag{35}$$

and so on.

B. Discretizing the saturation equation

The finite volume reformulation of the saturation equation (18) leads to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\frac{1}{h^2}\int_K S_{\text{w}} \mathrm{d}A \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{h}\Big((f(S_{\text{w}})v_{\text{tot },x})|_E - (f(S_{\text{w}})v_{\text{tot },x})|_W \\ &\qquad + (f(S_{\text{w}})v_{\text{tot },y})|_N - (f(S_{\text{w}})v_{\text{tot },y})|_S \Big) \\ &= \frac{Q_{\text{w}}}{h^2\phi} \cdot \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } K \text{ is the finite volume nearest to the well} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We identify the volume average

$$\frac{1}{h^2}\int_K S_{\text{w}} \mathrm{d}A =: S_K, \tag{37}$$

with the saturation at the center of the volume S_K. This is legit, as our scheme is just first order.

For the total Darcy velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}}$ we use the same discretization of the pressure gradients as in the pressure equation, (25). This makes it available at the boundaries (N, S, E, W), as required by (36).

For the flux function f at the boundaries, we use an upwind discretization. The standard formulation can be simplified by noting that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}S_{\text{w}}} f > 0 \tag{38}$$

and so instead of the advection velocity

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\text{w}}}(f \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}}) \tag{39}$$

we can use the Darcy velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}}$. We remember that this requires fixing the total Darcy velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_{\text{tot}}$ to be independent of the saturation S_{w}

For timestepping of the saturation equation (36) , we use explicit Euler, as this simplifies the Jacobian used in the Monte-Carlo adjoint.

C. Discretizing the cost function

The cost function (22) is discretized as a sum of squares over the timesteps, where the computed quantities with a tilde are taken to be the quantities in the volumes nearest to the well and the drill.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\Delta p(i\Delta t) - \tilde{\Delta p}^{(i)})^2, \tag{40}$$

where

$$\Delta_p(t) := p_{\text{well}}(t) - p_{\text{drill}}(t) \tag{41}$$

$$\tilde{\Delta p}^{(i)} := p^{(i)}_{\text{well cell}} - p^{(i)}_{\text{drill cell}} \tag{42}$$

and Δt is the timestep.

D. Formal definition of the residuals for the Monte-Carlo adjoint solver

First, we define the pressure residuals

$$\Pi_K^{(i)} := \begin{cases} p_K^{(i)} - p_{\text{well}}(i\Delta t), & \text{if } K \text{ is the cell nearest to the well} \\ T_E^{(i-1)}(p_K^{(i)} - p_R^{(i)}) \\ +T_W^{(i-1)}(p_K^{(i)} - p_L^{(i)}) \\ +T_N(p_K^{(i)} - p_U^{(i)}) \\ +T_S^{(i-1)}(p_K^{(i)} - p_D^{(i)}) - Q^{(i-1)}_{\text{tot, K}}, & \text{else} \end{cases}, \tag{43}$$

where

$$Q^{(i)}_{\text{tot, K}} := Q_{\text{tot}}(i\Delta t) \cdot \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } K \text{ is the cell nearest to the drill} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

The saturation residuals are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_K^{(i)} &:= S_{\text{w}}^{(i)}|_K - S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)}|_K \\ &\qquad + \frac{\Delta t}{h}\Big((f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v^{(i)}_{\text{tot },x})|_E - (f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v^{(i)}_{\text{tot },x})|_W \\ &+ (f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v^{(i)}_{\text{tot },y})|_N - (f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v^{(i-1)}_{\text{tot },y})|_S \Big) - \Delta t Q^{(i)}_{\text{tot, K}}. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

The required derivatives are lengthy to write out an can be found in subsection B

IV. Numerical experiments

Appendix

A. Source code

The source code can be obtained by visiting the repository at https://gitlab.ethz.ch/stefanow/mcadjoint

B. Computing the derivatives for the Monte-Carlo adjoint solver

The nonzero derivatives for the diagonal blocks are given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_K^{(i)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = T_E^{(i-1)} + T_W^{(i-1)} + T_N^{(i-1)} + T_S^{(i-1)} \tag{46}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_R^{(i)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = -T_E^{(i-1)} \tag{47}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_L^{(i)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = -T_W^{(i-1)} \tag{48}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_N^{(i)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = -T_U^{(i-1)} \tag{49}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_S^{(i)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = -T_D^{(i-1)} \tag{50}$$

for cells which are not nearest to the well

and by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial S_K^{(i)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} = 1 \tag{51}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial {S_{\mathrm{w}}}_K^{(i-1)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} &= -1 + f'({S_{\mathrm{w}}}_K^{(i-1)})\frac{\Delta t}{h}\cdot\Big(\mathbb{1}(v_{\text{tot, x}}|_E > 0)v_{\text{tot, x}}|_E \\ &\quad - \mathbb{1}(v_{\text{tot, x}}|_W < 0)v_{\text{tot, x}}|_W + \mathbb{1}(v_{\text{tot, y}}|_N > 0)v_{\text{tot, y}}|_N \\ &\quad - \mathbb{1}(v_{\text{tot, y}}|_S < 0)v_{\text{tot, y}}|_S\Big) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta t}{h}\cdot\Big(- f({S_{\mathrm{w}}}_K^{(i-1)})|_E\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\\ &\quad \lambda_{\text{tot, }R}, \lambda_{\text{tot, }K})\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda|_K\frac{\delta}{\delta x}p|_E \pm \dots\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial {S_{\mathrm{w}}}_R^{(i-1)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} &= f'({S_{\mathrm{w}}}_R^{(i-1)})\frac{\Delta t}{h}\cdot\mathbb{1}(v_{\text{tot, x}}|_E < 0)v_{\text{tot, x}}|_E \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta t}{h}\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}, \lambda_{\text{tot, }R})\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda|_R\frac{\delta}{\delta x}p|_E\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where

$$f'(S_{\mathrm{w}}) = \frac{2\mu_{\mathrm{o}}\mu_{\mathrm{w}}(1 - S_{\mathrm{w}})S_{\mathrm{w}}}{\phi\cdot\left(\mu_{\mathrm{w}}(1 - S_{\mathrm{w}})^2 + \mu_{\mathrm{o}}S_{\mathrm{w}}^2\right)^2} \tag{54}$$

$$\mathbb{1}(b) = \begin{cases}1, & \text{if } b \text{ true}\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{55}$$

For the off diagonal blocks, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial p_K^{(i)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} &= +\frac{\Delta t}{h^2}\Big(T_E^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_E \\ &\quad + T_W^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_W \\ &\quad + T_N^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_N \\ &\quad + T_S^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_S\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_R^{(i)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} = -\frac{\Delta t}{h^2}T_E^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_E \tag{57}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_L^{(i)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} = -\frac{\Delta t}{h^2}T_W^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_W \tag{58}$$

$$\tag{59}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_U^{(i)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} = -\frac{\Delta t}{h^2}T_N^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_N \tag{60}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_D^{(i)}}\Sigma_K^{(i)} = -\frac{\Delta t}{h^2}T_S^{(i-1)}f(S_{\mathrm{w}}^{(i-1)})|_S, \tag{61}$$

for cells not nearest to the well and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial {S_{\mathrm{w}}}_K^{(i-1)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} &= 2\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K \\ &\quad \sum_{n\in\{U,D,L,R\}}\frac{(p_K^{(i-1)} - p_n^{(i-1)})\cdot(\lambda_{\text{tot, }n}^{(i-1)})^2}{(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)} + \lambda_{\text{tot, }n}^{(i-1)})^2}\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial {S_{\mathrm{w}}}_R^{(i-1)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = 2\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_R\cdot\frac{(p_K^{(i-1)} - p_R^{(i-1)})\cdot(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)})^2}{(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)} + \lambda_{\text{tot, }R}^{(i-1)})^2} \tag{63}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial {S_{\mathrm{w}}}_L^{(i-1)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = 2\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_L\cdot\frac{(p_K^{(i-1)} - p_L^{(i-1)})\cdot(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)})^2}{(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)} + \lambda_{\text{tot, }L}^{(i-1)})^2} \tag{64}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial {S_{\mathrm{w}}}_U^{(i-1)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = 2\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_U\cdot\frac{(p_K^{(i-1)} - p_U^{(i-1)})\cdot(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)})^2}{(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)} + \lambda_{\text{tot, }U}^{(i-1)})^2} \tag{65}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial {S_{\mathrm{w}}}_D^{(i-1)}}\Pi_K^{(i)} = 2\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_D\cdot\frac{(p_K^{(i-1)} - p_D^{(i-1)})\cdot(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)})^2}{(\lambda_{\text{tot, }K}^{(i-1)} + \lambda_{\text{tot, }D}^{(i-1)})^2} \tag{66}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial S_{\mathrm{w}}}\lambda_{\text{tot}} = 2k\left(\frac{S_{\mathrm{w}} - 1}{\mu_{\mathrm{o}}} + \frac{S_{\mathrm{w}}}{\mu_{\mathrm{w}}}\right). \tag{67}$$

For solving the adjoint equations, we also need the derivatives of the residuals with respect to the parameters, in our case $\ln(k)$.

For the pressure residuals and if K is not the cell at the well, those read

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(k)_K}\Pi_K^{(i)} = \lambda^{(i-1)}|_K \sum_{n\in\{L,R,U,D\}} (p_K^{(i)} - p_n^{(i)})\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda^{(i-1)}|_n, \tag{68}$$

$$\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(k)_L}\Pi_K^{(i)} = (p_K^{(i)} - p_L^{(i)})\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_L \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_L) \tag{69}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(k)_R}\Pi_K^{(i)} = (p_K^{(i)} - p_R^{(i)})\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_R \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_R) \tag{70}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(k)_U}\Pi_K^{(i)} = (p_K^{(i)} - p_U^{(i)})\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_U \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_U) \tag{71}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(k)_D}\Pi_K^{(i)} = (p_K^{(i)} - p_D^{(i)})\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_D \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_D) \tag{72}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(a,b) := \frac{2a^2}{(a+b)^2}. \tag{73}$$

On the other hand, the saturation residuals Σ_K lead to the following derivatives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(k)_K}\Sigma_K = \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K \frac{\Delta t}{h}\Bigg(\quad (74)\\
&(f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},x}^{(i-1)})|_E \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_E, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta x}p|_E)\\
&-(f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},x}^{(i-1)})|_W \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_W, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta x}p|_W)\\
&+(f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},y}^{(i-1)})|_N \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_N, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta y}p|_N)\\
&-(f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},y}^{(i-1)})|_S \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_E, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_S)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta y}p|_S)\\
&\Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(K)_R}\Sigma_K = \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_R \frac{\Delta t}{h} f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},x}^{(i-1)})|_E \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_E)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta x}p|_E) \tag{75}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(K)_L}\Sigma_K = -\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_L \frac{\Delta t}{h} f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},x}^{(i-1)})|_W \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_L)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta x}p|_W) \tag{76}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(K)_U}\Sigma_K = \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_U \frac{\Delta t}{h} f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},x}^{(i-1)})|_N \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_U)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta y}p|_N) \tag{77}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln(K)_D}\Sigma_K = -\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_D \frac{\Delta t}{h} f(S_{\text{w}}^{(i-1)})v_{\text{tot},x}^{(i-1)})|_S \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathrm{hm}(\lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_K, \lambda_{\text{tot}}^{(i-1)}|_D)(-\frac{\delta}{\delta y}p|_S) \tag{78}$$

REFERENCES

[1] Q. Wang, D. Gleich, A. Saberi, N. Etemadi, and P. Moin, "A monte carlo method for solving unsteady adjoint equations," *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 227, no. 12, pp. 6184 – 6205, 2008. [Online]. Available: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999108001393

[2] C.-Y. CHEN and E. MEIBURG, "Miscible porous media displacements in the quarter five-spot configuration. part 1. the homogeneous case," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, vol. 371, p. 233268, 1998.

[3] A. Griewank and A. Walther, "Algorithm 799: Revolve: An implementation of checkpointing for the reverse or adjoint mode of computational differentiation," *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 19–45, Mar. 2000. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/347837.347846

[4] G. E. Forsythe and R. A. Leibler, "Matrix inversion by a monte carlo method," *Mathematics of Computation*, vol. 4, no. 31, pp. 127–127, sep 1950. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1090/s0025-5718-1950-0038138-x