Global Journal of Research in
Engineering and Technology
Journal homepage: https://gsjournals.com/gjret/
ISSN: 2980-4205 (Online)

(Review Article)

Towards an integrated model for predictive well control using real-time drilling fluid data

Kingsley Onyedikachi Omomo [1, *], Andrew Emuobosa Esiri [2] and Henry Chukwuemeka Olisakwe [3]

[1] *TotalEnergies Limited, Nigeria (c/o Benmaris Limited).*
[2] *Independent Researcher, Houston Texas, USA.*
[3] *Department of Mechanical Engineering, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.*

Global Journal of Research in Engineering and Technology, 2024, 02(02), 001–010

Publication history: Received on 18 August 2024; revis.ed on 01 October 2024; accepted on 04 October 2024

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.58175/gjret.2024.2.2.0027

Abstract

This paper explores the development of an integrated, real-time predictive model for well control that leverages data from drilling fluids to enhance operational safety and efficiency. Traditional well control methods, often reactive in nature, present significant limitations in managing the risks associated with well control issues, such as blowouts and kicks. By utilizing real-time data from drilling fluids—such as pressure, temperature, flow rate, and mud weight—predictive models enable early detection of potential well control problems, allowing for faster decision-making and proactive management of well stability. Key components of the model include data acquisition systems, real-time analytics, and decision-making algorithms that work together to minimize risks and reduce non-productive time (NPT). The paper also highlights the advantages of predictive well control in improving safety, mitigating operational risks, and its potential future applications in broader drilling operations.

Keywords: Predictive well control; Real-time drilling fluid data; Operational safety; Non-productive time (NPT); Well control risks; Integrated predictive model

1 Introduction

Well control is a critical aspect of drilling operations, aimed at preventing uncontrolled flow of formation fluids into the wellbore, which could lead to blowouts, environmental damage, and loss of life. Drilling environments are complex and dynamic, and managing the wellbore pressure to avoid such incidents is a significant challenge (Purba et al., 2021). The presence of unexpected high-pressure zones, permeability changes, and the constantly fluctuating wellbore conditions make well control a priority for any drilling operation. Traditional well control methods, which rely heavily on surface monitoring and historical data, often fall short in providing timely responses to well control incidents. As drilling operations become more sophisticated with deeper and more complex wells, the need for a more proactive and integrated approach to well control is evident (Francis & Ogbeide, 2021).

Drilling fluids, commonly known as mud, play a vital role in maintaining well control. The primary function of drilling fluids is to balance the downhole pressure, but they also carry valuable information about wellbore conditions. Real-time monitoring of drilling fluid properties—such as pressure, temperature, flow rate, and density—provides insight into the dynamic environment of the well (Deville, 2022). Changes in these parameters can be early indicators of well control issues, such as kicks (the influx of formation fluids into the wellbore) or losses (the outflow of drilling fluids into the formation). By leveraging real-time drilling fluid data, operators can monitor well conditions more closely and react promptly to any potential anomalies, reducing the risk of well control problems (Mohamed, Salehi, & Ahmed, 2021).

* Corresponding author: Kingsley Onyedikachi Omomo

This paper aims to propose an integrated, real-time predictive model for well control that leverages data from drilling fluids to anticipate and mitigate well control issues. By utilizing the continuous stream of data generated during drilling, the predictive model aims to enhance decision-making and operational safety, minimizing uncontrolled fluid flow risk and reducing non-productive time (NPT). This model will integrate real-time data analytics and decision-making algorithms to provide early warning signs, enabling proactive interventions before well control issues escalate.

2 Current Well Control Approaches

2.1 Traditional Methods

Well control is a fundamental aspect of drilling operations, primarily aimed at maintaining the pressure balance within the wellbore to prevent the uncontrolled release of formation fluids. Traditional well control methods, which have been employed for decades, rely heavily on surface-level monitoring and reactive measures. These methods typically involve monitoring key parameters like mud weight, pressure, and flow rate at the surface to detect signs of potential well control issues such as kicks—where formation fluids enter the wellbore—or loss of circulation, where drilling fluids escape into the formation (Cavalcanti De Sousa, 2020).

The primary goal of traditional well control approaches is to detect these issues as early as possible to implement appropriate corrective actions, such as adjusting mud density, increasing pump rates, or, in more severe cases, shutting in the well. One widely used technique is the *driller's method*, which involves shutting the well in and circulating the influx out of the wellbore using drilling fluid with the appropriate density to overbalance the formation pressure (Elrayah, 2024). Another conventional technique is the *wait-and-weight method*, where the influx is circulated out while simultaneously introducing heavier drilling fluid to regain control over the wellbore pressure. Both approaches rely on real-time surface measurements, and although they have proven effective in many cases, they are largely reactive in nature (Raabe & Jortner, 2021).

Surface monitoring in traditional methods typically involves the use of sensors and gauges placed at various points along the drilling equipment. These sensors measure parameters like pressure, temperature, and flow rate, which provide indirect indications of wellbore conditions. For instance, an unexpected increase in flow rate could suggest an influx of formation fluids, prompting the need for immediate corrective action (Binali et al., 2022). Additionally, traditional well control systems often include blowout preventers (BOPs), which serve as a mechanical barrier to close the well in the event of a significant pressure imbalance. However, BOP activation is generally a last resort, used only when all other well control measures have failed to prevent a blowout (Abdali, Mohamadian, Ghorbani, & Wood, 2021).

While these methods have been the cornerstone of well control for many years, they are not without their limitations. As drilling operations become more complex, particularly in deepwater and high-temperature/high-pressure (HPHT) environments, the reactive nature of these approaches poses significant risks to operational safety and efficiency.

2.2 Limitations

One of the most significant limitations of traditional well control methods is the inherent time delay between the onset of a well control issue and the detection of the problem at the surface. Drilling operations often take place in deep, remote reservoirs where changes in downhole conditions may not be immediately reflected in surface-level measurements. This delay can result in operators being unaware of critical changes in pressure, flow rate, or fluid properties until the problem has already escalated. When surface measurements indicate a potential issue, significant formation fluid may have already entered the wellbore, increasing the risk of a blowout or other well control failure (Olamigoke & James, 2022).

Another key limitation is the lack of real-time integration of downhole data into the decision-making process. Traditional well control models rely heavily on surface measurements and estimates of downhole conditions, which may not provide a complete picture of the dynamic environment within the well (Shi et al., 2023). This disconnect between downhole and surface data can lead to inaccurate assessments of well conditions, resulting in inappropriate or delayed corrective actions. For instance, an operator relying solely on surface data may underestimate the severity of a pressure imbalance, leading to ineffective well control measures that fail to stabilize the well (Cui et al., 2023).

In complex drilling environments, such as extended-reach or horizontal wells, the limitations of surface-level monitoring become even more pronounced. These wells often experience a greater degree of variation in downhole conditions, including fluctuations in pressure, temperature, and fluid composition. Traditional well control approaches, which are typically designed for vertical wells with more predictable pressure gradients, may struggle to account for these complexities. As a result, operators may be less able to detect early warning signs of well control issues, increasing the likelihood of operational failures (Ramirez, Basic, Merritt, Olson, & Van Domelen, 2022).

Moreover, traditional well control methods do not fully leverage the wealth of data generated during modern drilling operations. With advances in sensor technology and data acquisition systems, drilling operations now produce vast amounts of real-time data from various points along the wellbore (Goodkey et al., 2020). However, traditional methods often fail to integrate this data into a comprehensive well control strategy. Instead, they rely on manual interpretation of surface measurements, which can be slow and prone to human error. This limits the ability to make real-time data-driven decisions, further increasing the risk of well control incidents (Mohan et al., 2020).

The reactive nature of traditional well control methods also contributes to increased non-productive time (NPT) and operational inefficiencies. Because these methods are typically only implemented after a well control issue has been detected, they often involve shutting in the well and stopping drilling operations until the problem can be resolved. This downtime can be costly, particularly in high-cost environments such as offshore drilling, where each hour of lost productivity can result in significant financial losses. Furthermore, the time required to regain control of the well, adjust drilling parameters, and resume operations can extend well beyond the initial detection of the issue, compounding the overall delay (Lai et al., 2021).

Lastly, the reliance on historical data and experience in traditional well control approaches presents another limitation. While operators often base their well control decisions on previous incidents and established practices, these may not always apply to a particular well's unique conditions. As drilling operations push into more extreme environments, such as ultra-deepwater and HPHT reservoirs, the variability in well conditions becomes more pronounced, rendering historical data less useful for predicting and mitigating well control issues (Z Ruysschaert, 2021).

3 Role of Real-Time Drilling Fluid Data

3.1 Types of Drilling Fluid Data

Drilling fluid, or "mud," serves several critical functions during drilling operations, including maintaining wellbore pressure, cooling the drill bit, transporting cuttings to the surface, and stabilizing the wellbore (Deville, 2022). As drilling fluids circulate through the wellbore, they collect a wide array of data that provides valuable information about downhole conditions. Key parameters captured in real-time include pressure, temperature, flow rate, and mud weight, all of which are integral to understanding well dynamics (Al-Shargabi et al., 2022).

Pressure: One of the most critical variables in well control, pressure measurements provide real-time insight into the balance between downhole pressure and the formation pressure. Deviations in downhole pressure can indicate potential well control issues such as kicks or loss of circulation. Monitoring the equivalent circulating density (ECD) of the drilling fluid, which reflects the pressure exerted by the fluid at a given depth, helps maintain control over the well.

Temperature: Downhole temperature readings are essential for understanding the behavior of both the formation and the drilling fluid. High temperatures can impact the viscosity and density of drilling fluids, leading to changes in pressure and flow characteristics. These measurements help operators adjust drilling fluid properties to maintain wellbore stability and avoid thermal-induced well control issues (Ezeh, Ogbu, Ikevuje, & George, 2024; Ochulor, Sofoluwe, Ukato, & Jambol, 2024).

Flow Rate: Real-time monitoring of the flow rate of drilling fluids is another critical indicator of well control. The flow rate reflects the amount of fluid returning from the wellbore to the surface. A sudden increase in flow rate may suggest a kick, where formation fluids are entering the wellbore, while a decrease could indicate lost circulation. By tracking flow rate variations, operators can react quickly to changes in well conditions.

Mud Weight (Density): Mud weight, or the density of the drilling fluid, is a crucial factor in maintaining wellbore pressure. The weight of the mud needs to be carefully calibrated to balance the formation pressure and prevent formation fluids from entering the well. Real-time mud weight measurements allow operators to make on-the-fly adjustments, ensuring that the mud's weight remains optimal for maintaining well control (Jambol, Ukato, Ozowe, & Babayeju, 2024; Ogbu, Ozowe, & Ikevuje, 2024).

Other drilling fluid parameters that provide useful data include viscosity, gas content, and salinity. Each of these factors influences the well's overall stability and the drilling fluid's effectiveness. By continuously monitoring these parameters in real-time, operators can maintain a precise balance of forces within the wellbore, reducing the risk of well control issues (Karakosta, Mitropoulos, & Kyzas, 2021).

3.2 Impact on Well Control

The real-time collection and analysis of drilling fluid data significantly enhance the ability of operators to manage well control proactively. Unlike traditional methods, which rely on surface-level monitoring and manual interpretation of historical data, real-time data provides immediate feedback on changing wellbore conditions, allowing for faster and more informed decision-making (Zhdaneev, Frolov, & Petrakov, 2021).

One of the most valuable aspects of real-time drilling fluid data is its ability to provide early warning signs of potential well control issues such as kicks or losses. A kick occurs when formation fluids—such as gas, oil, or water—enter the wellbore due to an imbalance between the drilling fluid pressure and the formation pressure (Yalamarty et al., 2022). If not detected early, a kick can escalate into a blowout, resulting in catastrophic environmental and safety consequences. Similarly, lost circulation, where drilling fluids escape into the formation rather than returning to the surface, can compromise well control and lead to formation damage (Ogbu, Iwe, Ozowe, & Ikevuje, 2024; Ukato, Jambol, Ozowe, & Babayeju, 2024).

Real-time data allows operators to detect these events early by identifying subtle changes in key parameters such as pressure and flow rate. For instance, a sudden increase in the flow rate or a drop in downhole pressure can indicate the presence of a kick, prompting immediate action to prevent further escalation. Likewise, monitoring mud weight and viscosity in real time helps operators maintain the correct balance between formation pressure and drilling fluid pressure, reducing the likelihood of kicks and losses (Hafezi, 2023).

Another major benefit of real-time drilling fluid data is that it continuously monitors wellbore conditions throughout the drilling process. This enables dynamic adjustments to well control measures as conditions evolve. For example, suppose real-time pressure data indicates that the ECD is approaching critical levels. In that case, operators can quickly adjust the pump rate or mud weight to avoid a well control incident (Olamigoke & James, 2022). This level of real-time responsiveness is not possible with traditional, reactive well control methods, which rely on delayed surface-level data. By allowing operators to detect and respond to well control issues in real time, drilling fluid data also contributes to the reduction of non-productive time (NPT). Quick detection of anomalies such as kicks or lost circulation can prevent the need for more extensive interventions, such as shutting in the well or conducting complex remedial operations. This proactive approach helps keep drilling operations on schedule, minimizing costly downtime (Ali, 2024).

3.3 Data Quality and Challenges

Despite the clear advantages of using real-time drilling fluid data for well control, there are several challenges associated with data quality, accuracy, and transmission. These challenges must be addressed to ensure that the data collected is reliable and actionable. The accuracy of real-time drilling fluid data is heavily dependent on the calibration of sensors and measurement equipment. Sensors placed in harsh downhole environments are exposed to extreme pressures, temperatures, and chemical interactions, all of which can degrade their performance over time. Regular calibration and maintenance of these sensors are essential to ensure that the data they produce is accurate. Inaccurate data can lead to incorrect decision-making, potentially compromising well control (Sood et al., 2021).

The real-time nature of the data depends on the speed and reliability of transmission from the downhole sensors to the surface. Transmission systems must be capable of handling large volumes of data at high frequencies without introducing significant delays. Communication systems can sometimes be prone to interference or signal loss, particularly in deepwater or remote drilling environments. This can create latency in the data, delaying the detection of well control issues and reducing the effectiveness of real-time monitoring (Shangguan et al., 2020).

Another challenge with real-time drilling fluid data is the sheer volume of information generated during drilling operations. While this data is valuable, it can also be overwhelming for operators to interpret in real time. Advanced data analytics tools are necessary to process and filter the data, identifying key trends and anomalies that require immediate attention. Without these tools, operators may struggle to make sense of the data in a timely manner, reducing the overall effectiveness of real-time monitoring (Rivas & Abrao, 2020).

Integrating real-time drilling fluid data with existing well control systems can also be a challenge, particularly in older drilling rigs where legacy systems may not be equipped to handle modern data acquisition technologies. Ensuring that all components of the drilling system—old and new—can work together seamlessly is essential for maximizing the benefits of real-time data (Gooneratne et al., 2020).

In conclusion, real-time drilling fluid data offers significant benefits for well control by providing early warnings of potential issues, enabling dynamic adjustments, and reducing non-productive time. However, challenges related to data accuracy, transmission, and interpretation must be addressed to fully realize the potential of this technology. As drilling operations continue to evolve, the importance of real-time data will only grow, making it an indispensable tool for maintaining well integrity and ensuring the safety of drilling operations (Yakoot, Elgibaly, Ragab, & Mahmoud, 2021).

4 Integrated Predictive Model for Well Control

4.1 Concept of Predictive Well Control

Predictive well control is a forward-looking approach that utilizes real-time data and advanced analytics to predict potential well control issues before they become critical. This method contrasts with traditional well control techniques, which are largely reactive and focus on managing problems after they have been detected. Predictive well control shifts the focus to prevention, using data-driven insights to identify warning signs of potential issues early on, allowing operators to take preemptive actions (Khosravanian & Aadnoy, 2021).

The core concept of predictive well control revolves around continuously monitoring and analyzing wellbore parameters in real time, such as pressure, temperature, flow rate, and drilling fluid properties. These parameters are fed into sophisticated algorithms and models that simulate downhole conditions and predict future trends. By identifying deviations or anomalies in these data points, predictive models can alert operators to the likelihood of events such as kicks, loss of circulation, or blowouts before they occur (Abdalla, 2023).

This proactive approach allows for a much faster response, minimizing the risk of operational failures and improving overall well safety. Predictive well control helps prevent hazardous situations and reduces the need for emergency interventions like shutting in the well or activating blowout preventers, which are costly and time-consuming procedures. Instead, minor adjustments to drilling parameters or fluid properties can be made in real time, maintaining well stability and reducing non-productive time (NPT) (Ahmed, Assadi, Ahmed, & Banihabib, 2023).

4.2 Components of the Integrated Model

An integrated predictive model for well control is built upon several key components that work together to deliver real-time insights and enable proactive decision-making. These components include data acquisition systems, real-time analytics, decision-making algorithms, and human-machine interfaces for efficient communication between the model and operators (Jiang, Liu, Li, Zhang, & Wang, 2021).

The foundation of the predictive model is the data acquisition system, which continuously gathers real-time data from various sensors located throughout the drilling system. These sensors capture critical parameters, including mud weight, pressure, temperature, and flow rate. High-quality, accurate data is essential for making reliable predictions, so the data acquisition system must be equipped with robust sensors and regular calibration to ensure that it provides consistent and accurate information. Advances in sensor technology and communication infrastructure, such as wired drill pipe and downhole telemetry systems, have made it possible to collect real-time data directly from the wellbore, significantly enhancing the quality of the information used in predictive models (Aseel, Roy, & Sunil, 2023).

Once data is collected, it is processed and analyzed in real time. This is where the power of predictive modeling lies. Advanced analytics software uses machine learning algorithms, statistical models, and physical simulations to analyze the data and detect patterns or anomalies that could indicate potential well control issues (Alsaihati, Elkatatny, Mahmoud, & Abdulraheem, 2021). These algorithms are trained on historical drilling data and can continuously learn and improve over time. They can simulate wellbore conditions, estimate the future behavior of the well, and identify early signs of instability, such as unexpected pressure spikes or abnormal flow rates. Real-time analytics aims to detect deviations from expected norms that may signal the onset of a well control issue (Nystad, 2021).

Once a potential issue is identified, decision-making algorithms take over. These algorithms evaluate the severity of the detected anomaly and suggest the best course of action based on pre-programmed well control protocols and historical data (Biecek & Burzykowski, 2021). For example, suppose the system detects that the equivalent circulating density (ECD) is approaching unsafe levels. In that case, adjusting the mud weight or slowing down the drilling rate may be recommended to prevent a kick. These algorithms can also prioritize different risks, ensuring that the most urgent issues are addressed first. In some advanced models, the system can even automate minor corrective actions, such as adjusting pump rates or altering drilling fluid properties, without waiting for manual intervention (Aseel et al., 2023).

While automation plays a crucial role in predictive well control, human operators remain an essential part of the process. The HMI ensures that operators are kept informed about the real-time condition of the well and any recommendations made by the predictive model. The interface presents data in a user-friendly format, allowing operators to interpret the information and make informed decisions easily. In many cases, the HMI provides alerts and visualizations that highlight potential well control issues, enabling operators to act quickly. The interaction between human operators and the predictive model is critical for maintaining flexibility and ensuring that any unexpected or novel situations are addressed effectively (Mehrotra et al., 2022).

4.3 Advantages of Integration

The integration of real-time drilling fluid data into predictive well control models offers numerous advantages over traditional well control methods. These benefits range from improved operational safety to enhanced efficiency and reduced costs. One of the most significant advantages of an integrated predictive model is its ability to detect and control issues early. By continuously analyzing real-time data, the model can identify subtle changes in wellbore conditions that might not be immediately apparent to human operators. For example, a slight deviation in flow rate or pressure could indicate a developing kick, allowing the operator to take corrective action before the problem escalates. This early detection capability greatly reduces the risk of blowouts and other catastrophic events, enhancing overall well safety (Hassan & Mhmood, 2021).

Predictive models enable faster decision-making by providing operators with real-time insights and automated recommendations. In a traditional well control scenario, operators must rely on surface-level data and manual interpretation, which can introduce delays and increase the risk of incorrect decisions. An integrated model, on the other hand, delivers real-time analytics and actionable recommendations directly to the operator, allowing for quick, data-driven decisions. This speed is particularly crucial in high-pressure/high-temperature (HPHT) environments or deepwater drilling, where well control issues can escalate rapidly if not addressed promptly (Coito et al., 2021).

One of the challenges in drilling operations is the inherent uncertainty of subsurface conditions. Even with extensive planning, unexpected events such as formation kicks, wellbore instability, or equipment failures can occur. A predictive model helps operators manage these events more effectively by simulating a wide range of potential outcomes based on real-time data. This allows operators to stay one step ahead of any emerging issues and make proactive adjustments to maintain well control. For example, suppose the model detects a pressure surge. In that case, it can recommend reducing the drilling rate or increasing the mud weight, preventing the situation from worsening (Sarker, 2021).

Non-productive time is one of the most significant cost drivers in drilling operations, particularly in offshore environments where operational delays can be extremely costly (Gamal et al., 2024). Predictive well control models help reduce NPT by identifying and addressing well control issues before they require more drastic interventions, such as shutting in the well or stopping drilling operations. By continuously monitoring well conditions and making real-time adjustments, operators can keep the drilling process running smoothly, minimizing downtime and maintaining productivity (Muhammad RidwanAndiPurnomo, 2020).

The integration of real-time data into well control processes also improves overall operational efficiency. By automating many of the routine monitoring and decision-making tasks, predictive models free up operators to focus on more complex aspects of the drilling operation. This reduces the cognitive load on operators and ensures that well control decisions are based on the latest available data, improving the accuracy and effectiveness of those decisions. The ability to quickly adjust drilling parameters in response to real-time conditions also reduces the need for costly and time-consuming remedial actions (Hafezi, 2023).

5 Impact on Operational Safety and Efficiency

5.1 Enhanced Operational Safety

One of the most critical impacts of predictive well control is its ability to enhance the safety of drilling operations. In traditional well control methods, operators often rely on delayed or surface-level data to detect potential issues, leaving little time to respond to emergencies such as kicks or blowouts. If not identified early, these events can escalate into catastrophic incidents, leading to environmental damage, equipment loss, and even fatalities (Onita & Ochulor, 2024; Ozowe, Sofoluwe, Ukato, & Jambol, 2024b).

Predictive well control systems, which use real-time data from sensors in the wellbore, offer a major improvement in detecting early warning signs of potential hazards. Predictive models can identify deviations that signal instability in the wellbore by continuously monitoring key parameters such as pressure, flow rate, and mud weight. For instance, a sudden rise in flow rate may indicate a formation kick, while changes in mud density can signal the onset of a wellbore collapse. Early detection allows operators to make real-time adjustments to drilling parameters, such as modifying mud weight or reducing the drilling rate, preventing the issue from escalating into a full-blown blowout (Ozowe, Sofoluwe, Ukato, & Jambol, 2024a; Sofoluwe, Ochulor, Ukato, & Jambol, 2024).

Additionally, using advanced decision-making algorithms within these models can automate some of the responses, ensuring that critical actions are taken even if human operators cannot react in time. This capability significantly enhances the safety of the drilling environment, reducing the risks to both personnel and the surrounding ecosystem (Johnson, 2023).

5.2 Reduction of Non-Productive Time (NPT)

Non-productive time (NPT) is one of the major cost drivers in drilling operations, particularly in offshore or deepwater environments where time delays can quickly translate into significant financial losses. NPT refers to any time during drilling operations when no progress is being made, often due to equipment failures, well control issues, or unplanned downtime (Eustes et al., 2021).

Predictive well control plays a key role in reducing NPT by identifying potential well control problems before they become severe enough to halt operations. With real-time data flowing from the wellbore, predictive models can forecast potential issues such as kicks, lost circulation, or wellbore instability, enabling operators to address these problems early. By making minor adjustments to the drilling process, operators can avoid more drastic interventions, such as shutting down the well or conducting expensive remedial operations, which are often necessary when well control issues are allowed to develop unchecked. Predictive models keep the drilling process running smoothly by preventing major well control incidents, thereby minimizing downtime. This proactive approach to well management ensures continuous operation and leads to significant cost savings and improved overall efficiency (Abdali et al., 2021).

5.3 Future Trends and Applications

As drilling operations become increasingly digitalized, the application of predictive models is expected to expand beyond well control. Future trends suggest that predictive analytics could be used in a variety of other areas within drilling operations, further enhancing both safety and efficiency. For example, predictive models could be applied to equipment maintenance, where real-time data from machinery could be used to anticipate failures and schedule maintenance before breakdowns occur. This would reduce both NPT and repair costs.

Another potential application is in reservoir management, where real-time data on reservoir pressure and flow could be used to optimize production rates and extend the life of wells. Predictive models could also be integrated into automated drilling systems, allowing for more precise control over drilling parameters and reducing human error in complex drilling environments.

6 Conclusion

Integrating real-time drilling fluid data into predictive well control models represents a major advancement in the oil and gas industry's ability to manage well control risks proactively. Traditional methods, which rely on surface-level data and reactive decision-making, are often limited by delays in detecting wellbore instability and other critical issues. By utilizing real-time data on key parameters like pressure, flow rate, temperature, and mud weight, predictive models can provide early warnings of potential well control issues, such as kicks and blowouts. This shift from reactive to predictive well control enhances operational safety and efficiency, reducing the likelihood of catastrophic incidents and minimizing non-productive time (NPT).

The key components of the integrated predictive model, including advanced data acquisition systems, real-time analytics, and decision-making algorithms, offer a robust solution for managing the complexities of modern drilling operations. These systems allow for quicker, more informed decision-making, helping operators to prevent well control problems before they escalate. Moreover, the ability to automate responses to minor well control issues further strengthens the safety and reliability of drilling operations.

In addition to improving safety and reducing NPT, predictive well control has promising potential for future applications. As the oil and gas industry embraces digitalization, predictive models may extend into other areas, such as equipment maintenance and reservoir management, offering even greater operational efficiencies. In conclusion, adopting integrated predictive models for well control is a significant step in ensuring drilling operations' safety, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness. As these models evolve and become more widespread, they will play an increasingly vital role in the future of well control and broader drilling operations.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

[1] Abdali, M. R., Mohamadian, N., Ghorbani, H., & Wood, D. A. (2021). Petroleum well blowouts as a threat to drilling operation and wellbore sustainability: causes, prevention, safety and emergency response. *Journal of Construction Materials| Special Issue on Sustainable Petroleum Engineering ISSN, 2652*, 3752.

[2] Abdalla, R. M. (2023). *Exploring the Adoption of a Conceptual Data Analytics Framework for Subsurface Energy Production Systems*: Papierflieger.

[3] Ahmed, N., Assadi, M., Ahmed, A. A., & Banihabib, R. (2023). Optimal design, operational controls, and data-driven machine learning in sustainable borehole heat exchanger coupled heat pumps: Key implementation challenges and advancement opportunities. *Energy for Sustainable Development, 74*, 231-257.

[4] Al-Shargabi, M., Davoodi, S., Wood, D. A., Al-Musai, A., Rukavishnikov, V. S., & Minaev, K. M. (2022). Nanoparticle applications as beneficial oil and gas drilling fluid additives: A review. *Journal of Molecular Liquids, 352*, 118725.

[5] Ali, A. H. (2024). *Mitigation Strategies for Shallow Gas Hazards: A Comparative Analysis and Proposal for Enhanced Prevention Technique.* UIS,

[6] Alsaihati, A., Elkatatny, S., Mahmoud, A. A., & Abdulraheem, A. (2021). Use of machine learning and data analytics to detect downhole abnormalities while drilling horizontal wells, with real case study. *Journal of Energy Resources Technology, 143*(4), 043201.

[7] Aseel, A., Roy, R., & Sunil, P. (2023). Predictive big data analytics for drilling downhole problems: A review. *Energy Reports, 9*, 5863-5876.

[8] Biecek, P., & Burzykowski, T. (2021). *Explanatory model analysis: explore, explain, and examine predictive models*: Chapman and Hall/CRC.

[9] Binali, R., Kuntoğlu, M., Pimenov, D. Y., Usca, Ü. A., Gupta, M. K., & Korkmaz, M. E. (2022). Advance monitoring of hole machining operations via intelligent measurement systems: A critical review and future trends. *Measurement, 201*, 111757.

[10] Cavalcanti De Sousa, P. (2020). *The Dynamics of Drilling Fluid Rheology, Wllbore Flow, and Formation Pressure in Well Control.*

[11] Coito, T., Firme, B., Martins, M. S., Vieira, S. M., Figueiredo, J., & Sousa, J. M. (2021). Intelligent sensors for real-Time decision-making. *Automation, 2*(2), 62-82.

[12] Cui, B., Chen, L., Zhang, N., Shchipanov, A., Demyanov, V., & Rong, C. (2023). Review of Different Methods for Identification of Transients in Pressure Measurements by Permanent Downhole Gauges Installed in Wells. *Energies, 16*(4), 1689.

[13] Deville, J. P. (2022). Drilling fluids. In *Fluid Chemistry, Drilling and Completion* (pp. 115-185): Elsevier.

[14] Elrayah, A. A. I. (2024). Enhancing drilling operations: prioritizing wellbore integrity, formation preservation, and effective mud waste control (case study). *Journal of Engineering and Applied Science, 71*(1), 86.

[15] Eustes, A., Bourdon, N., Joshi, D., McKenna, K., Uzun, O., Zody, Z., . . . Amer, A. (2021). Onshore Drilling. *Advances in Terrestrial and Extraterrestrial Drilling:: Ground, Ice, and Underwater*, 63.

[16] Ezeh, M., Ogbu, A., Ikevuje, A., & George, E. (2024). Optimizing risk management in oil and gas trading: A comprehensive analysis. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences, 6*(7), 1461-1480.

[17] Francis, M., & Ogbeide, P. O. (2021). Analysis on the Impact of Losses of Well Control During Offshore Drilling. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Engineering and Applied Sciences, 12*(4), 109-113.

[18] Gamal, H., Albahri, S., Essa, H., Srivastava, M., Alghamdi, N., & Shaikh, W. (2024). *Driving Operational Excellence: Cost Savings and Performance Optimization Through Tripping and Connection Time Optimization.* Paper presented at the International Petroleum Technology Conference.

[19] Goodkey, B., Hernandez, G., Nunez, A., Corona, M., Atriby, K., Rayes, M., . . . Herrera, C. (2020). *Drilling in the Digital Age: Harnessing Intelligent Automation to Deliver Superior Well Construction Performance in Major Middle Eastern Gas Field.* Paper presented at the Abu Dhabi International Petroleum Exhibition and Conference.

[20] Gooneratne, C. P., Magana-Mora, A., Otalvora, W. C., Affleck, M., Singh, P., Zhan, G. D., & Moellendick, T. E. (2020). Drilling in the fourth industrial revolution—Vision and challenges. *IEEE Engineering Management Review, 48*(4), 144-159.

[21] Hafezi, S. (2023). *Real-time detection of drilling problems & issues during drilling by listing & using their signs both on the surface and downhole.* NTNU,

[22] Hassan, A., & Mhmood, A. H. (2021). Optimizing network performance, automation, and intelligent decision-making through real-time big data analytics. *International Journal of Responsible Artificial Intelligence, 11*(8), 12-22.

[23] Jambol, D. D., Ukato, A., Ozowe, C., & Babayeju, O. A. (2024). Leveraging machine learning to enhance instrumentation accuracy in oil and gas extraction. *Computer Science & IT Research Journal, 5*(6), 1335-1357.

[24] Jiang, H., Liu, G., Li, J., Zhang, T., & Wang, C. (2021). A realtime drilling risks monitoring method integrating wellbore hydraulics model and streaming-data-driven model parameter inversion algorithm. *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering, 85*, 103702.

[25] Johnson, J. (2023). Automating the OODA loop in the age of intelligent machines: reaffirming the role of humans in command-and-control decision-making in the digital age. *Defence Studies, 23*(1), 43-67.

[26] Karakosta, K., Mitropoulos, A. C., & Kyzas, G. Z. (2021). A review in nanopolymers for drilling fluids applications. *Journal of Molecular Structure, 1227*, 129702.

[27] Khosravanian, R., & Aadnoy, B. S. (2021). *Methods for petroleum well optimization: automation and data solutions*: Gulf Professional Publishing.

[28] Lai, S. W., Ng, J., Eddy, A., Khromov, S., Paslawski, D., van Beurden, R., . . . Spivey, B. J. (2021). Large-scale deployment of a closed-loop drilling optimization system: implementation and field results. *SPE drilling & completion, 36*(01), 47-62.

[29] Mehrotra, S., Wang, M., Wong, N., Parker, J. i., Roberts, S. C., Kim, W., . . . Horrey, W. J. (2022). Human-Machine Interfaces and Vehicle Automation: A Review of the Literature. *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 109*, 18-28.

[30] Mohamed, A., Salehi, S., & Ahmed, R. (2021). Significance and complications of drilling fluid rheology in geothermal drilling: A review. *Geothermics, 93*, 102066.

[31] Mohan, R., Hussein, A., Mawlod, A., Al Jaberi, B., Vesselinov, V., Salam, F. A., . . . Al Daghar, K. (2020). *Data driven and ai methods to enhance collaborative well planning and drilling risk prediction.* Paper presented at the Abu Dhabi International Petroleum Exhibition and Conference.

[32] Muhammad RidwanAndiPurnomo, S. (2020). Reducing Non-Productive Time (NPT) In The Seven Well Drilling Project On The North Beach Of Javafrom PT Multi Jaya Tehnik.

[33] Nystad, M. (2021). Real-Time Data-Driven Drilling Optimization.

[34] Ochulor, O. J., Sofoluwe, O. O., Ukato, A., & Jambol, D. D. (2024). Technological advancements in drilling: A comparative analysis of onshore and offshore applications. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 22*(2), 602-611.

[35] Ogbu, A. D., Iwe, K. A., Ozowe, W., & Ikevuje, A. H. (2024). Innovations in Real-Time Pore Pressure Prediction Using Drilling Data: A Conceptual Framework. *Innovations, 20*(8), 158-168.

[36] Ogbu, A. D., Ozowe, W., & Ikevuje, A. H. (2024). Oil spill response strategies: A comparative conceptual study between the USA and Nigeria. *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 20*(1), 208-227.

[37] Olamigoke, O., & James, I. (2022). Advances in Well Control: Early Kick Detection and Automated Control Systems. In *Drilling Engineering and Technology-Recent Advances New Perspectives and Applications*: IntechOpen.

[38] Onita, F. B., & Ochulor, O. J. (2024). Geosteering in deep water wells: A theoretical review of challenges and solutions.

[39] Ozowe, C., Sofoluwe, O. O., Ukato, A., & Jambol, D. D. (2024a). Advances in well design and integrity: Areview of technological innovations and adaptive strategies for global oil recovery. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences, 12*(1), 133-144.

[40] Ozowe, C., Sofoluwe, O. O., Ukato, A., & Jambol, D. D. (2024b). Future directions in well intervention: A conceptual exploration of emerging technologies and techniques. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal, 5*(5), 1752-1766.

[41] Purba, D., Adityatama, D. W., Fadhillah, F. R., Al-Asyari, M. R., Ivana, J., Abi, R., & Anugrah, R. P. (2021). *A Discussion on Oil & Gas and Geothermal Drilling Environment Differences and Their Impacts to Well Control Methods.* Paper presented at the PROCEEDINGS, 47th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering.

[42] Raabe, G., & Jortner, C. S. (2021). *Universal Well Control*: Gulf Professional Publishing.

[43] Ramirez, A., Basic, D., Merritt, J., Olson, K., & Van Domelen, M. (2022). *Automating a Breakthrough Technology for Real-Time Diagnostics: Sealed Wellbore Pressure Monitoring.* Paper presented at the SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference and Exhibition.

[44] Rivas, A. E. L., & Abrao, T. (2020). Faults in smart grid systems: Monitoring, detection and classification. *Electric Power Systems Research, 189*, 106602.

[45] Sarker, I. H. (2021). Data science and analytics: an overview from data-driven smart computing, decision-making and applications perspective. *SN Computer Science, 2*(5), 377.

[46] Shangguan, X.-C., Zhang, C.-K., He, Y., Jin, L., Jiang, L., Spencer, J. W., & Wu, M. (2020). Robust load frequency control for power system considering transmission delay and sampling period. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, 17*(8), 5292-5303.

[47] Shi, J., Dourthe, L., Li, D., Deng, L., Louback, L., Song, F., . . . Groover, J. (2023). Real-Time Underreamer Vibration Predicting, Monitoring, and Decision-Making Using Hybrid Modeling and a Process Digital Twin. *SPE drilling & completion, 38*(02), 201-219.

[48] Sofoluwe, O. O., Ochulor, O. J., Ukato, A., & Jambol, D. D. (2024). AI-enhanced subsea maintenance for improved safety and efficiency: Exploring strategic approaches.

[49] Sood, K., Nosouhi, M. R., Kumar, N., Gaddam, A., Feng, B., & Yu, S. (2021). Accurate detection of IoT sensor behaviors in legitimate, faulty and compromised scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing, 20*(1), 288-300.

[50] Ukato, A., Jambol, D. D., Ozowe, C., & Babayeju, O. A. (2024). Leadership and safety culture in drilling operations: strategies for zero incidents. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 6*(6), 1824-1841.

[51] Yakoot, M. S., Elgibaly, A. A., Ragab, A. M., & Mahmoud, O. (2021). Well integrity management in mature fields: a state-of-the-art review on the system structure and maturity. *Journal of Petroleum Exploration and Production, 11*, 1833-1853.

[52] Yalamarty, S. S., Singh, K., Kamyab, M., Cheatham, C., Crkvenjakov, V., & Flurry, K. (2022). *Early detection of well control kick events by applying data analytics on real time drilling data.* Paper presented at the SPE/IADC Drilling Conference and Exhibition.

[53] Z Ruysschaert, W. G. (2021). *Making risk-informed decisions to optimize drilling operations using along string measurements with Wired drill pipe a high-speed, high-quality telemetry alternative to traditional mud pulse telemetry.* uis,

[54] Zhdaneev, O., Frolov, K., & Petrakov, Y. (2021). Predictive systems for the well drilling operations. In *Cyber-Physical Systems: Design and Application for Industry 4.0* (pp. 347-368): Springer.