

# TReacLab: An object-oriented implementation of non-intrusive splitting methods to couple independent transport and geochemical software

Daniel Jara, Jean-Raynald de Dreuzy, Benoit Cochepin

# ▶ To cite this version:

Daniel Jara, Jean-Raynald de Dreuzy, Benoit Cochepin. TReacLab: An object-oriented implementation of non-intrusive splitting methods to couple independent transport and geochemical software. Computers & Geosciences, 2017, 109, pp.281-294. 10.1016/j.cageo.2017.09.005 . insu-01588325

# HAL Id: insu-01588325 https://insu.hal.science/insu-01588325v1

Submitted on 15 Sep 2017  $\,$ 

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Accepted Manuscript

TReacLab: An object-oriented implementation of non-intrusive splitting methods to couple independent transport and geochemical software

Daniel Jara, Jean-Raynald de Dreuzy, Benoit Cochepin

PII: S0098-3004(17)30251-0

DOI: 10.1016/j.cageo.2017.09.005

Reference: CAGEO 4019

To appear in: Computers and Geosciences

Received Date: 6 March 2017

Revised Date: 1 September 2017

Accepted Date: 7 September 2017

Please cite this article as: Jara, D., Dreuzy, J.-R.d., Cochepin, B., TReacLab: An object-oriented implementation of non-intrusive splitting methods to couple independent transport and geochemical software, *Computers and Geosciences* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.cageo.2017.09.005.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



TReacLab: an object-oriented implementation of non-intrusive
 splitting methods to couple independent transport and geochemical
 software

4 Daniel Jara<sup>1</sup>, Jean-Raynald de Dreuzy<sup>1</sup>, Benoit Cochepin<sup>2</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Géosciences Rennes, UMR CNRS 6118, Campus de Beaulieu, University of Rennes 1,

6 Rennes, France

7 <sup>2</sup>ANDRA, 1/7 Rue Jean Monnet, 92298 Châtenay-Malabry, France

8 Abstract

Reactive transport modeling contributes to understand geophysical and geochemical processes 9 in subsurface environments. Operator splitting methods have been proposed as non-intrusive 10 11 coupling techniques that optimize the use of existing chemistry and transport codes. In this spirit, we propose a coupler relying on external geochemical and transport codes with 12 appropriate operator segmentation that enables possible developments of additional splitting 13 methods. We provide an object-oriented implementation in TReacLab developed in the 14 15 MATLAB environment in a free open source frame with an accessible repository. TReacLab 16 contains classical coupling methods, template interfaces and calling functions for two 17 classical transport and reactive software (PHREEQC and COMSOL). It is tested on four 18 classical benchmarks with homogeneous and heterogeneous reactions at equilibrium or 19 kinetically-controlled. We show that full decoupling to the implementation level has a cost in 20 terms of accuracy compared to more integrated and optimized codes. Use of non-intrusive 21 implementations like TReacLab are still justified for coupling independent transport and chemical software at a minimal development effort but should be systematically and carefully 22 23 assessed.

Keywords: Porous media; Reactive transport; Operator splitting; Object-oriented
programming.

26 Corresponding author: daniel.jara.heredia@gmail.com

27 **1. Introduction** 

The fate of chemical species in geological media results from the interaction of physical 28 transport and chemical reactivity (Steefel et al., 2005). Understanding how they interact 29 requires field and laboratory studies as well as numerical models. Numerical models are 30 31 important for building predictive scenarios where experiments are limited spatially and temporally, as in long-term nuclear waste disposal assessment (Marty et al., 2014; Thouvenot 32 et al., 2013; Trotignon et al., 2007). On the physical transport side, extensive work in applied 33 34 mathematics and computational science has provided widely-used software for single and 35 multi-phase flows as well as transport of chemical species such as MODFLOW (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988), MT3DMS (Zheng and Wang, 1999), HYDRUS (Kool and Van 36 Genuchten, 1991), COMSOL (COMSOL, 2010), FEFLOW (Diersch, 1996), MRST (Lie, 37 2014), and TOUGH2 (Pruess et al., 1999). On the chemistry side, geochemical software have 38 39 implemented a wide range of chemical functions and reactions, including equilibrium aqueous 40 speciation, equilibrium mineral dissolution/precipitation, gas phase exchange, ion exchange, 41 redox reactions, and kinetic reactions. Some of these software are PHREEQC (Parkhurst and Appelo, 1999), GEMS (Kulik et al., 2013), CHEPROO (Bea et al., 2009), MINTEQ 42 (Peterson et al., 1987), CHESS (Van der Lee, 2002), and Geochemist's Workbench (Bethke, 43 44 2007).

To combine physical and chemical reactivity, couplers have been developed between
transport and geochemical codes such as PHAST for coupling HST3D and PHREEQC
(Parkhurst *et al.*, 2004), HP1 for HYDRUS and PHREEQC (Šimůnek *et al.*, 2006), PHT3D

48 for MT3DMS and PHREEQC (Prommer et al., 1999), HYTEC for RT1D/R2D2/METIS and CHESS (van der Lee et al., 2003), OpenGeoSys-GEMS (Kulik et al., 2013) and iCP for 49 PHREEQC 2014), UTCHEM-IPhreeqc 50 COMSOL and (Nardi et al., and UTCHEM-EOBATCH (Kazemi Nia Korrani et al., 2015, 2016), multicomponent transport 51 52 software-IPhreegc (Muniruzzaman and Rolle, 2016), FEFLOW-IPhreegc (MIKE(DHI), 2016), Lattice Boltzmann transport software-IPhreeqc (Patel et al., 2013). Most of the 53 previously cited codes have embedded the coupling method with the geochemical and 54 55 transport methods to enhance global performance and reliability. Here, in order to gain flexibility, we propose in our code TReacLab a complementary development in the form of an 56 57 ensemble of Operator Splitting methods (OS) with a generic set of interfaces to transport and 58 reaction operators. In this context, OS decouples chemistry from transport as opposed to 59 global implicit solvers, which have been proven to be more accurate but less flexible 60 (Hammond et al., 2012; Hammond et al., 2014; Mayer, 2000; Steefel, 2009; Zhang, 2012). TReacLab is designed as an open toolbox where additional OS techniques can be 61 62 implemented and benchmarked. Other transport and geochemical codes may also be used at 63 the minimal cost of developing the necessary interfaces. TReacLab is written in MATLAB based on a series of abstract classes using object-oriented programming (Commend and 64 Zimmermann, 2001; Register, 2007; Rouson et al., 2011). 65

After recalling in section 2 the reactive transport and OS formalism used, we present in section 3 our OS implementation. We especially show how to implement alternative OS methods and how to connect other transport and geochemical codes. Methods are assessed and discussed on the basis of 3 benchmarks in section 4.

#### 70 **2. Numerical model**

### 71 **2.1. Reactive transport equation**

72 The reactive transport equation can be written in a general way as (Saaltink *et al.*, 1998):

$$\frac{\partial \theta c}{\partial t} = ML(c) + \theta S_{\theta}^{t} r_{\theta} + \theta S_{k}^{t} r_{k} + Q, \qquad (1)$$

73 where c is the vector of concentrations for  $N_s$  chemical species in the system.  $\Theta$  is a diagonal

matrix containing the porosity or volumetric content of the phase. *M* is a diagonal matrix that specifies whether a species is mobile or immobile. Its diagonal elements are 1 or 0 accordingly.  $S_k^t$  and  $S_e^t$  are the transposed stoichiometric matrix for kinetic and equilibrium reactions, respectively.  $r_e$  and  $r_k$  (ML<sup>-3</sup>T<sup>-1</sup>) are the reaction rates of the  $N_e$  equilibrium and  $N_k$ kinetic reactions, respectively. *Q* is the external sink/source term (ML<sup>-3</sup>T<sup>-1</sup>). *L* is the transport operator (ML<sup>-3</sup>T<sup>-1</sup>), which includes advection and diffusion. In the following, we consider only single-phase flow:

$$L(c) = \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{D}\nabla c - \theta v c]. \tag{2}$$

81 **D** (L<sup>2</sup>T<sup>-1</sup>) is the effective dispersion-diffusion tensor (Bear, 1972). The velocity  $\boldsymbol{\nu}$  (LT<sup>-1</sup>) is

computed in a pre-processing phase, which can be decoupled from the reactive transport problem as long as hydraulic properties are not modified by the chemical reactivity. The chemical system can be generically written as the combination of the  $N_e$  equilibrium reactions:

$$\emptyset_{\mathfrak{g}}(c) = 0, \tag{3}$$

85 and of the  $N_k$  kinetically-controlled reactions:

$$r_k = \emptyset_k(c) \,. \tag{4}$$

The reactive transport problem is thus made up of the  $N_s$  mass balance equation (1) and of the  $N_e + N_k$  equilibrium and kinetic equations (3) and (4). Its unknowns are the concentrations cand the reaction rates  $r_e$  and  $r_k$ . The chemical equilibrium system (3) is composed of the conservation equation and of the mass action law, relating reactants and products (Apoung-Kamga *et al.*, 2009; Molins *et al.*, 2004):

$$S_{g} \log(c) = \log(K), \tag{5}$$

91 where *K* is the vector of equilibrium constants.

92 Components *u* are generally introduced when considering equilibrium reactions (Saaltink *et*93 *al.*, 2011):

$$u = Uc, (6)$$

where *U* is the component matrix (Fang *et al.*, 2003; Friedly and Rubin, 1992; Hoffmann *et al.*, 2012; Kräutle and Knabner, 2005; Steefel *et al.*, 2005). They are  $N_s - N_e$  linear combinations of chemical species that are not modified by equilibrium reactions (Molins *et al.*, 2004; Morel and Hering, 1993):

$$US_{e}^{t}r_{e}^{r}=0.$$
(7)

98 The component matrix is not unique. However, its application to equation (1) always leads to 99 a reduced system without the equilibrium rates but with the components *u* (Molins *et al.*, 100 2004; Saaltink *et al.*, 1998):

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = UML(c) + U\theta S t_k^t r_k + UQ$$

(8)

- 101 The reactive transport problem is then made up of the  $2N_s N_e + N_k$  equations (3-6) and (8)
- 102 for the same number of unknowns u, c and  $r_k$ .
- 103 Under the assumption that solid species are not transported and all species have the same
- 104 diffusion coefficient (i.e. UML(c) = UL(u)). Equation (8) classically gives the two following
- 105 formulations TC and CC (Amir and Kern, 2010):

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = L(u_a) + U\theta S_k^t r_k + UQ.$$
<sup>(9)</sup>

CC:

TC:

$$\frac{\partial u_a}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u_f}{\partial t} = L(u_a) + U\theta S {}^{t}_{k} r_k + UQ.$$
(10)

106 where  $u_a = UMc$  and  $u_f = U(I - M)c$  are the aqueous and fixed components. In the TC

107 formulation, the fixed species concentration are deducted from the solution in the total 108 component concentration (T) and the solute concentration (C). In the CC formulation, the 109 total component concentration is divided in aqueous and fixed components.

### 110 **2.2.** Usual first-order sequential non-iterative and iterative approaches

In this section, we show how the reactive transport problem can be solved using independent transport and chemical solvers. We distinguish the sequential non-iterative and iterative approaches respectively based on TC and CC formulations. For the sequential non-iterative approach, we extract from the TC formulation, the transport operator in which we keep the sink/source term:-

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = L(u_{\alpha}) + UQ. \tag{11}$$

The chemical operator derives from equations (3-6), and (8). Note that it does not contain anysource/sink term, as it has been included in the transport equation:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = U S_k^z r_k$$

$$r_k = \Phi_k(c)$$

$$u = Uc$$

$$\Phi_g(c) = 0.$$
(12)

This is still a system of  $2N_s - N_e + N_k$  equations for the same number of unknowns. This decoupled system can be solved with the classical sequential non-iterative approach using an explicit integration of temporal derivatives (herein, we assume forward Euler). The solution at time step n+1 can be obtained from the solution at time step n, with the following successive application of the transport and chemical operators in a sequential approach:  $u^* = u_n + \Delta t (L(u_a) + UQ)$ 

 $\begin{cases} u^* = Uc_{n+1} \\ (\emptyset_s(c_{n+1}) = 0 \end{cases}$  $r_{k_{n+1}} = \emptyset_k(c_{n+1})$  $n+1 = u^* + \Delta t US_k^t r_{k_{n+1}}$ 

(13)

123 The transport operator (11) is applied to the components. Then the chemical operator is applied with the updated mobile components for speciation between fixed and solute 124 concentrations. In the specific case where chemical reactions are all at equilibrium and no 125 126 kinetics is involved, a TC formulation is used to fully decouple (de Dieuleveult et al., 2009). In such case the decoupling does not then rely on operator splitting, but on a block 127 128 Gauss-Seidel method. When the stability conditions of the explicit integration are too much 129 constraining, implicit schemes should be used instead within a sequential iterative approach 130 (Carrayrou et al., 2004; de Dieuleveult and Erhel, 2010; Yeh and Tripathi, 1989):

$$u_{n+1} = u_n + \Delta t [L(u_{a_{n+1}}) + \theta S_k^t r_{k_{n+1}} + UQ]$$

$$\begin{cases} u_{n+1} = Uc_{n+1} \\ \emptyset_{\sigma}(c_{n+1}) = 0 \end{cases}$$
(14)

$$r_{k_{n+1}} = \emptyset_k(c_{n+1})$$

# 131 Classical Picard's method have been extensively used to solve such kind of problems:

$$u_{n+1}^{k+1} = u_n + \Delta t \left[ L(u_{a_{n+1}}^{k+1}) + \theta S_k^t r_{k_{n+1}}^k + UQ \right]$$

$$\begin{cases} u_{n+1}^{k+1} = Uc_{n+1}^{k+1} \\ \emptyset_{e}(c_{n+1}^{k+1}) = 0 \end{cases}$$
(15)  
$$r_{k_{n+1}}^{k+1} = \emptyset_{k}(c_{n+1}^{k+1}),$$

132 where *k* is the index of the Picard iteration method instantiated by:

$$u_{n+1}^{k=1} = u_n$$

(16)

 $r_{k_{n+1}}^{k=1} = r_{k_n}.$ 

We recall the necessity to check the consistency of the temporal integration scheme with the Operator Splitting method chosen. With this decomposition, explicit first-order scheme naturally leads to sequential non-iterative approach. The implicit first-order scheme requires a sequential iterative approach. Other choices are possible and might reduce errors depending on the chemical system (Barry *et al.*, 1996). As it should be possible to test and benchmark them at a reduced development cost, we use a generic decoupling formalism that can be used to implement a broad range of schemes.

#### 140 **2.3. Generic operator splitting implementation**

141 The reactive transport system can be generically split in two operators. Using the formalism
142 of Gasda *et al.* (2011), equation (1) can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial Z}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_1 Z + \mathcal{L}_2 Z, \qquad \qquad Z(t=0) = Z_0, \qquad \qquad 0 \le t \le T, \tag{17}$$

143 where  $\mathbb{Z}$  is the unknown,  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  can be equation (11) and (12), respectively. Other

decomposition are possible, e.g. the transport operator can be subdivided into an advection and a diffusion-dispersion operator (Clement *et al.*, 1998), or one operator might contain advection-reaction and the other diffusion (Liu and Ewing, 2005). Each operator will be solved separately for a splitting time step  $\Delta t = t^{n+1} - t^n$  using adapted numerical methods.

148 The generic operator splitting methods implemented into the Toolbox are the sequential 149 splitting, additive splitting, Strang splitting, symetrically weighted splitting, and alternating 150 method (Appendix A). Assuming exact integration of the operators and homogeneous 151 boundary conditions in equation (18), the first two have a first-order temporal truncation 152 error, and the following three a second-order one (Hundsdorfer and Verwer, 2013). Since the 153 operators are usually solved using numerical methods, the global order of such approaches 154 might be modified because of the order of the numerical methods used for each operator 155 (Barry et al., 1996; Csomós and Faragó, 2008). The alternating splitting increases the order of 156 the sequential splitting if the time steps are small enough (Simpson and Landman, 2008; 157 Valocchi and Malmstead, 1992).

### 158 **3.** Operator splitting implementation and software organization

We provide in TReacLab an object-oriented toolbox for the non-intrusive operator splitting methods of the previous section. TReacLab is organized along three main components for coupling transport and reactivity, and proceeds in three pre-processing, processing and post-processing phases (Figure 1). These three components correspond to the three

163 well-identified coupler, transport and chemistry classes. The three classes are fully segmented 164 and exchange information through interfaces. Segmentation ensures that any of the three 165 coupler, transport and chemistry classes can be replaced without modifications of any of the two other ones. The solution of the reactive transport problem after spatial discretization 166 eventually consists in the temporal integration with the chosen OS technique, which 167 iteratively calls transport and geochemical solvers through interfaces (Figure 1, middle row). 168 169 This is the core of the simulation that we identify as the processing phase. It is generic and 170 does not require at run time any further specification of transport, reactivity and coupler 171 methods. Standard error management techniques are used to stop the algorithm when any of the integration method of the three classes fails, stopping the running process and returning 172 173 adapted error messages.



174

Figure 1: General software organization of TReacLab with the three coupler, transport and chemistry classes in columns, and the three pre-processing, processing, and post-processing phases in rows. Generic components represented in black are the organization and the coupler class. External software for transport and chemistry are represented in blue with hatched line (cannot be modified). Red boxes highlight the instantiation and interface methods that must be developed when connecting new transport or chemistry software.

The processing phase can be generic because all specifications of the coupler, transport, and chemistry classes are performed in a pre-processing phase (Figure 1, first row). The pre-processing phase consists in the instantiation of the coupler, transport and chemical classes, in the preparation of the interfaces that will transfer information and in the specifications of the initial conditions. As detailed in Appendix B, instantiations are code dependent. Instantiation can be done externally for example with the definition of a transport

187 or chemical problem through the graphical user interface of software like COMSOL or 188 PHREEQC. It can also be done internally by a method within TReacLab specifying the inputs 189 and parameters to existing interfaces like IPhreeqc (Charlton and Parkhurst, 2011), 190 PhreeqcRM (Parkhurst and Wissmeier, 2015), or COMSOL livelink (COMSOL, 2010). Even 191 when instantiation is complex, it remains independent for each of the three classes. 192 Cross-dependencies and feedback between transport and reactivity like density-driven flows 193 with reacting species are not supported at this stage, although they may be important in some 194 applications like CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration (Abarca et al., 2013).

195 Pre-processing phase specifies the initial conditions and transfers them to the coupler in charge of starting the numerical integration. Post-processing is generic and only consists in 196 formatting and storing output concentrations and solver performances (Figure 1, bottom row). 197 198 Specifications are all restricted to the instantiation of the software and interface in the pre-processing phase while processing and post-processing remain fully generic. Connections 199 between specific algorithms and generic structures are done by interfaces. Appendix B 200 provides a detailed description of the transport and chemistry classes, defining the interfaces 201 202 to the external codes.

#### 203 4. Examples and benchmarks

The three following examples validate the methods and illustrate the implementation presented in sections 2 and 3. The three of them are based on a 1D hydraulically homogeneous system with steady-state flow and uniform dispersion (equation (2)).The examples are compared visually against analytical solution or well-know numerical software. Moreover, we show a convergence study for the first case being the reference solution the numerical solution with finest time resolution.

210 The four examples display evolving degrees of complexity both in terms of chemical systems 211 and in terms of software called for transport and reactivity, software versions are given in 212 Table 1. The first example is a single-species transport with first-order decay. The transport solver is COMSOL and the chemical solver is a simple analytical solution. This example is 213 214 used to assess the different coupling algorithms implemented and to check the implementation 215 the interface with COMSOL. The second example is an equilibrium of 216 precipitation/dissolution chemical system in a 1D hydraulically homogeneous system. 217 Chemical solver is IPhreeqc. Several solvers have been compared for the transport solver, 218 both to check IPhreeqc interface implementation and to evaluate the effect of the transport 219 solver. The third example is the most advanced in terms of chemistry. Chemical reactions are 220 partly in equilibrium and partly kinetically controlled. They involve precipitation and dissolution reactions. The chemical code is PhreeqcRM. It is used in combination with 221 222 COMSOL as transport solver. The last problem face a 2D unsaturated system where transport is modeled by Richards equation and solved by COMSOL. Chemistry is solved by 223 224 PhreeqcRM. These four test cases have been chosen to check the implementation and assess 225 the coupling methods developed. They are also simple enough from the development point of view to be taken as starting points to model more advanced chemical systems and transport 226 227 conditions.

Software	Version
MATLAB	R2013b
COMSOL	4.3b
PHREEQC	3.3.7
IPhreeqc	3.3.7
PhreeqcRM	3.3.9

228 Table 1: Software versions.

### 229 4.1. Single-species transport with first-order decay

A single-species transport with first-order decay using different OS methods is compared toan analytical solution (Van Genuchten and Alves, 1982). The reactive transport system

232 contains a single solute species of concentration c:

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial c} = L(c) - kc, \tag{18}$$

where L is given by equation (2). Equation (18) can straightforwardly be separated into transport and chemistry operators corresponding to the two right-hand side terms.

At time 0, the solute concentration is 0 in the domain (c(x, t=0) = 0). The concentration at the left boundary is constant and equal to 1 mol/m<sup>3</sup>  $(c(x = 0, t) = 1 \text{ mol/m}^3)$ . The boundary condition on the right side of the domain is a perfectly absorbing condition  $(c(x = x_{\text{max}}, t) = 0)$ .

Parameters are derived from Steefel and MacQuarrie (1996) and given in Table 2. The solver for transport is COMSOL and an analytical solution is used for the first-order decay. Solute concentration progressively invades the domain from the left boundary with a smooth profile resulting from the combination of dispersion and decay (Figure 2). Second-order methods perform much better than first-order methods as expected. Errors are more pronounced at the inlet boundary condition on the left side of the domain where the concentration is higher

(Steefel and MacQuarrie, 1996; Valocchi and Malmstead, 1992). The sequential splitting 244 245 method with the transport operator performed first overestimates the amount of reaction for 246 the whole domain since it considers that all incoming solute is getting in without decay for the full first time step. If the sequence of operators is exchanged, namely first chemistry is solved, 247 248 and then transport is solved, the amount of reaction is underestimated. The second-order alternating splitting, which alternates between transport-chemistry and chemistry-transport 249 250 steps, shows strong improvement with compensations between overestimation in the first 251 application of the chemical operator and underestimation in the second application of the 252 chemical operator (Simpson and Landman, 2008; Valocchi and Malmstead, 1992).

Parameter	Value	
<b>v</b> [m/y]	100	
<i>D</i> [m <sup>2</sup> /y]	20	
$k [y^{-1}]$	100	
<i>x</i> <sub>max</sub> [m]	6	
$\Delta x [m]$	0.4	
$\Delta t [y]$	4 10 <sup>-3</sup>	

253 Table 2: Parameters for the single-species transport with first-order decay benchmark. **v** is

254 the velocity, D is the dispersion coefficient, k is the decay rate,  $x_{max}$  is the length of the 1D 255 column,  $\Delta x$  is the grid size, and  $\Delta t$  is the time step.



Figure 2: Comparison of first- and second-order OS for the single-species transport with
first-order decay at t = 0.5 y. Parameters are given in Table 2. Analytical solution is derived
from Van Genuchten and Alves (1982).

The error at time t = 0.5 y is taken as the quadratic relative difference over the domain of the finest time step of the numerical solution and the numerical solutions for the corresponding time step,  $c_{NF}$  and  $c_N$  respectively:

$$\|e\|_{2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{x}} \left(\frac{c_{NF}^{i}(t) - c_{N}^{i}(t)}{c_{NF}^{i}(t)}\right)^{2}}.$$
(19)

Table 3 displays the values for evolving time steps and shows that all methods converge with the time. The reference finest time step for each method has been  $\Delta t = 2 \ 10^{-4}$  s (i.e.  $c_{NF}^{i}(t)$ value). While all methods perform well, the sequential method is more accurate than the additive one and second-order methods are overall more accurate than first-order methods. The performance on convergence arranged on descending order is given by Strang, symmetrically weighted splitting, alternating, sequential and additive.

		1 <sup>st</sup> order		2 <sup>nd</sup> order		
ш	$\Delta t$ (y)	Additive	Sequential	Alternating OS	Strang	SWS
= 0.4	4 10 <sup>-3</sup>	1,107	0,1667	0,075	0,032	0,049
$\nabla x =$	2 10 <sup>-3</sup>	0,514	0,079	0,032	0,026	0,028
	4 10-4	0,114	0,019	0,029	0,031	0,029

268 Table 3: Error  $\|e\|_2$  of equation (19) for the single-species transport with first-order decay

269 with different OS methods and splitting time steps.

### **4.2. Calcite dissolution**

271 Calcite dissolution and dolomite formation has become a classical benchmark for reactive 272 transport problems with sharp precipitation/dissolution fronts (Beyer et al., 2012; Engesgaard 273 and Kipp, 1992; Prommer et al., 1999). Progressive introduction of magnesium calcium in a 274 domain at equilibrium between calcium carbonate in solution and calcite (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) dissolves 275 the calcite and precipitates dolomite  $(CaMg(CO_3)_2)$ . This chemical system has been modeled 276 with the physical and chemical parameters given by Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6. Chemical 277 concentrations are initially homogeneous. At the initial time (t = 0), the chemical system is 278 destabilized with the introduction of magnesium instead of calcium at the upper boundary 279 condition (x = 0), inducing the dissolution/precipitation process. The boundary condition at the downstream limit  $(x_{max})$  is a simple outflow of the solutes. 280

281 Here, we show how transport solvers can be applied and validate our interface to IPhreeqc. 282 IPhreeqc performs the computation of components, aqueous speciation, precipitation and 283 dissolution reactions (Charlton 2011). The database and Parkhurst, used is 284 'NAPSI\_290502(260802).dat'. Transport is solved either with COMSOL Multiphysics (COMSOL, 2012), with a finite difference spatial discretization and forward Euler time 285

integration, derived from built-in pdepe function of MATLAB (Skeel and Berzins, 1990).
Transport and chemistry are coupled through the simple sequential approach of equations
(A.1)-(A.3). PHREEQC is independently run as 1D reactive transport solver for general
comparison.

Parameter	Value	
<b>v</b> [m/s]	10 <sup>-5</sup>	
$D [m^2/s]$	6.7 10 <sup>-8</sup>	
$x_{\max}[m]$	0.25	
$\Delta x [m]$	0.01	
$\Delta t$ [s]	50	$\langle \cdot \rangle$

- 290 Table 4: Physical parameters for the calcite dissolution benchmark. *v* is the average velocity,
- 291 *D* is the dispersion coefficient,  $x_{max}$  is the maximum length of the column,  $\Delta x$  is the grid size,
- 292 and  $\Delta t$  is the time step.

Chemical Component and Species	Initial value	Boundary value at x=0
Ca [mol/L]	1.23 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0
C [mol/L]	1.23 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0
Cl [mol/L]	0	2 10 <sup>-3</sup>
Mg [mol/L]	0	10-3
pH [-]	9.91	7
Calcite [mol/L]	2 10 <sup>-4</sup>	-
Dolomite [mol/L]	0	-

293 Table 5: Calcite dissolution benchmark initial and boundary values for aqueous components
294 and mineral species. In PHREEQC, components are called elements.

Homogeneous reactions	log (K)
$2H^+ + 2e^- \leftrightarrow H_2$	-3.1055
$2H_2O - 4H^+ - 4e^- \leftrightarrow O_2$	-85.9862
$HCO_3^- + 9H^+ + 8e^ 3H_2O \leftrightarrow CH_4$	27.8493
$H_2 O - H^+ \leftrightarrow O H^-$	-13.9995
$H^+ - H_2O + HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow CO_2$	6.3519
$HCO_3^ H^+ \leftrightarrow CO_3^{2-}$	-10.3289
$Ca^{2+}-H^++HCO_3^-\leftrightarrow CaCO_3$	-7.1048
$Ca^{2+} + HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow CaHCO_3^+$	1.1057
$Ca^{2+}+H_2O-H^+\leftrightarrow CaOH^+$	-12.78
$Mg^{2+} - H^+ + HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow MgCO_3$	-7.3492
$Mg^{2+} + HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow MgHCO_3^+$	1.0682
$Mg^{2+} + H_2O - H^+ \leftrightarrow MgOH^+$	-11.44
Homogeneous reactions	
Calcite	
$CaCO_3 \leftrightarrow Ca^{2+} - H^+ + HCO_3^-$	1.849
Dolomite	4 118
$CaMg(CO_3)_2 \leftrightarrow Ca^{2+} + Mg^{2+} - 2H^+ + 2HCO_3^-$	7.110

Table 6: Chemical system of the calcite dissolution benchmark. The upper part comprises the
homogeneous equations and the lower part the heterogeneous reactions. The first column
shows the equilibrium reactions and the second one the logarithms of equilibrium constants.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 display aqueous and mineral equivalent concentrations at time  $t = 10^4$  s. As magnesium and chloride get in the domain (Figure 3b and Figure 3d), calcite progressively dissolves and is replaced by dolomite as expected (Figure 4). Some of the calcium remains in solution and is flushed out (Figure 3a and Figure 3c). Because of the subsequent absence of calcium in solution, dolomite dissolves again with some increase of calcium in solution (Figure 3a and Figure 3c). The three different transport solvers give the same tendency as the PHREEQC solution.





306

307 Figure 4: Dolomite and calcite equivalent concentration profiles with open and filled symbols 308 respectively at time  $t = 10^4$  s.

Although COMSOL leads to good results, it is more than one order of magnitude slower than the two other transport methods (Table 7). We checked that this large difference in performances does not come from the numerical method but from the large time required for COMSOL to start and stop when called numerous times externally. While this might not be

- an issue for large transport problems for which limitations will rather come from transport
- 314 operator, it is a constrain for smaller tests and benchmarks.

Software Coupling	Time
IPhreeqc + COMSOL	668 s
IPhreeqc + FD script	24 s
IPhreeqc + pdepe	40 s

315 Table 7: Time performance for the calcite dissolution benchmark using a sequential operator
316 splitting.

317 Whatever the coupling method, the consistency with PHREEQC is overall good. Although 318 COMSOL uses, as default, implicit time integration schemes for solving the transport 319 equation instead of the required explicit method, it still compares well with PHREEOC and 320 the other software couplings. Indeed, the sequential non iterative method requires an explicit 321 time integration for transport (equation (13)). It is not the case for COMSOL which uses (as 322 default) a backward differentiation formula temporal integration scheme, which order varies with the internal time step adaptation (COMSOL, 2012). It thus introduces an additional error 323 in the coupling scheme (de Dieuleveult et al., 2009). However, by using such stable and 324 325 accurate temporal integrations, it enhances the robustness of the transport scheme.

326 **4.3. Mixed equilibrium-kinetic system** 

We simulate the progressive increase of dissolved species in an atmospheric water infiltrating a granitic bedrock. This test case is derived from Nardi *et al.* (2014). The hydraulic properties of the system are found in Table 8. The infiltrating water has much lower concentrations of dissolved species than the resident water. It interacts with five minerals (Table 9). It is in equilibrium with calcite. The four other minerals k-feldspar, illite, albite and pyrite are subject to kinetically controlled dissolution with rates ranging from  $10^{-13}$  to  $10^{-11}$  mol/s. All

parameters and rate laws of the simulation are provided in the PHREEQC file of iCP (Nardi *et al.*, 2014). The infiltrating water dissolves calcite to maintain equilibrium, increasing both the concentration of calcium and the pH of the solution. Other minerals also dissolve and increase the concentrations of Al and K in solution, however at a much slower rate because of the kinetic control of the reactions. pH is eventually buffered by the dissolution of illite and pyrite.

Parameter	Value
₽ [m/s]	2.78 10 <sup>-6</sup> m/s
<i>D</i> [m/s]	5.55 10 <sup>-9</sup> m <sup>2</sup> /s
$x_{\max}[m]$	0.08 m
$\Delta x [m]$	10 <sup>-3</sup> m
$\Delta t$ [s]	720 s

339 Table 8: Parameters for mixed equilibrium-kinetic benchmark. v is the average velocity, D is

340 the dispersion coefficient,  $x_{max}$  is the maximum length of the column,  $\Delta x$  is the grid size, and

the

is

splitting

time.

341  $\Delta t$ 

Chemical Component and Species	Initial value	Boundary value
Ca [mol/L]	1.4 10 <sup>-3</sup>	3 10 <sup>-4</sup>
C [mol/L]	4.9 10 <sup>-3</sup>	$1.9 \ 10^{-4}$
Cl [mol/L]	1.1 10 <sup>-2</sup>	9 10 <sup>-4</sup>
Mg [mol/L]	7.4 10 <sup>-4</sup>	2 10 <sup>-4</sup>
Mn [mol/L]	3.4 10 <sup>-6</sup>	0
S [mol/L]	9.6 10 <sup>-4</sup>	4.8 10 <sup>-4</sup>
Na [mol/L]	1.3 10 <sup>-2</sup>	3 10 <sup>-4</sup>
K [mol/L]	$2.5 \ 10^{-4}$	7.1 10 <sup>-4</sup>
Fe [mol/L]	7.2 10 <sup>-6</sup>	5.4 10 <sup>-5</sup>
Sr [mol/L]	0	6.8 10 <sup>-7</sup>
Si [mol/L]	2 10 <sup>-4</sup>	2.5 10 <sup>-6</sup>
Al [mol/L]	5.1 10 <sup>-9</sup>	10 <sup>-8</sup>
P [mol/L]	3.8 10 <sup>-6</sup>	0
Br [mol/L]	1.7 10 <sup>-5</sup>	0
F [mol/L]	3.1 10 <sup>-5</sup>	1.6 10 <sup>-5</sup>
pH [-]	7.5144	7.3
pe [-]	-3.0836	13.6
Calcite [mol/L]	6.065	-
K-feldspar [mol/L]	0.239	-
Illite [mol/L]	0.144	-
Albite [mol/L]	0.289	-
Pyrite [mol/L]	1.17	-

2ª

343 *Table 9: Aqueous components and mineral species for mixed equilibrium-kinetic benchmark.* 

To simulate this set of reactions, we have chosen PhreeqcRM to assess the flexibility of TReaCLab. Transport is simulated with COMSOL to benefit from the accurate transport solver, it uses a variable order (between 1 and 5) backward differentiation formula. In the

347 presence of both kinetically controlled and equilibrium reactions, both the quality of the 348 transport and reactive integrations and coupling issues may be critical. We choose a simple 349 sequential OS method with the successive integration of transport and reactivity. The results obtained by the coupling of COMSOL and PhreeqcRM are close to the solution given by 350 351 PHREEQC alone for the dissolved species and kinetically dissolving minerals (Figure 5). The 352 time step of the coupled PhreeqcRM and COMSOL integration has been taken smaller than 353 the characteristic mesh scale transport time and reactive time at least for the kinetical reaction 354 to ensure accurate integrations. The most difficult quantity to get accurately is the calcium 355 concentration because calcite is at equilibrium. The time step must be reduced to recover a 356 steeper reactive front (Figure 6).

This more advanced test shows that the computational load should be well balanced between the coupler, transport and chemistry methods. While coupling is the critical component in cases of equilibrium reactions and may even require highly integrated coupling strategies like global implicit methods (Hoffmann *et al.*, 2010; Saaltink *et al.*, 2001), it is not the case for kinetically controlled reactions. In this case of mixed equilibrium kinetic reaction, elementary coupling and accurate transport and reactive solvers can be efficient with small enough time steps where sharp reaction fronts are involved.



Figure 5: Comparison of results between the coupling of PhreeqcRM and COMSOL and
PHREEQC observed for the mixed equilibrium-kinetic benchmark at the output of the column.



367

368 Figure 6: Quantity of dissolved calcite with PhreeqcRM and COMSOL for two different 369 splitting time steps  $\Delta t = 720$  s, 360 s and 90 s. PHREEQC independently is used as reference.

#### **4.4. Pesticide infiltration**

The following benchmark concerns the infiltration in an unsaturated soil column of a 371 carbamate insecticide (Aldicarb) (MIKE(DHI), 2016; Multiphysics, 2008; Šimůnek et al., 372 1994; Wissmeier and Barry, 2011). The soil column is a 2D axisymmetric cylinder made up 373 374 of two layers with a smaller hydraulic conductivity in the upper layer but higher saturation. 375 Transport is modeled by Richards' equation and solved by COMSOL (Figure 7). Aldicarb is 376 transported downwards and sideways from the infiltration (top of the column from r = 0 m to r = 0.25 m). Chemistry is described by first-order decay chain reactions (Figure 8), being only 377 mobile Aldicarb, Aldicarb sulfoxide and Aldicarb sulfone (i.e. the other species are fix 378 379 species). These system of ordinary differential equations is solved by PhreeqcRM.



383 Figure 8:Aldicarb reaction chain.

384 The simulation time is 8 days with a splitting time step of 0.05 days. The number of nodes is 3936 nodes. Figure 9a and Figure 9b show the concentration in the soil column of Aldicarb 385 386 and Aldicarb sulfone, respectively. Aldicarb disappears fast from the domain since its kinetic constant are fast in comparison to the kinetic constants of the daughter species. Therefore, 387 388 Aldicarb (and also Aldicarb oxime) are presented close to the infiltration condition. On the 389 contrary, the other daughter species (Aldicarb sulfoxide, aldicarb sulfone, aldicarb sulfoxide 390 oxime, aldicarb sulfone oxime) have a similar distribution in the domain. Figure 9c and 9d 391 show the concentration of Aldicarb and Aldicarb sulfone when r = 0 m for the different OS 392 methods and COMSOL alone. It is possible to see a good agreement between all the methods, 393 although a discrepancy between the methods and COMSOL is observable. The discrepancy is 394 related to the OS error and the chosen integration time scheme for the chemistry step.

CER NY



Figure 9: a) Aldicarb contour plot after 8 days, b) Aldicarb oxime contour plot after 8 days, c) Concentration aldicarb at r = 0 m for all the methods and Comsol, d) Concentration aldicarb oxime at r = 0 m for all the methods and Comsol.

#### 398 **5. Discussion**

As shown by many previous studies and by the four examples of the previous section, reactive transport problems can be solved by a wide diversity of transport, chemistry, and operator splitting methods. No method is currently accepted as systematically more accurate and efficient than any other. Integration of the transport and chemistry operators in PHREEQC using more appropriate splitting with advection-reaction on one side and diffusion-reaction on

404 the other side leads to better resolution of chemical fronts as shown in the second and third 405 cases (Parkhurst and Appelo, 1999), but such front can be obtained by smaller time steps. It is 406 not only the integration but also the successive improvements of the methods that lead to significantly more accurate schemes. TReacLab results remain however close, displaying the 407 408 same overall behavior both on solute and mineral concentrations. The interest of fully 409 segmented reactive transport implementations like in TReacLab is not motivated by the 410 accuracy and should not be used when other more integrated and optimized software are 411 appropriate and freely available.

412 Despite their lower accuracy, fully segmented implementations may be useful in situations 413 where flexibility is essential. It is the case when extensive modeling work has been performed 414 in independent software environments for transport or chemistry, and extensions to reactive 415 transport problems are required. Transport and chemistry solvers are then imposed and should 416 be coupled with as few specific developments as possible. For example, COMSOL and 417 PHREEQC have been interfaced here and in several other works because of their 418 complementarity (Nardi et al., 2014; Nasir et al., 2014; Wissmeier and Barry, 2011). It is 419 possible to specify advanced geometrical configurations in COMSOL through a convenient 420 graphical user interface (Azad et al., 2016). PHREEQC provides advanced capacities for 421 modeling complex geochemical systems with extensive database of reactions (Charlton and 422 Parkhurst, 2011; Parkhurst and Wissmeier, 2015). In such cases, building the structure of the 423 model may be the first and dominant issue in developing simulation capacities. That is when 424 codes like TReacLab can provide practical bridges for reactive transport systems. The 425 examples of section 4 however shows that they must be used with great care. Especially, the 426 called software may have different temporal integration schemes than the explicit and implicit 427 methods required by the SNIA and SIA coupling methods as discussed for the higher-order 428 schemes of COMSOL in section 4. Using codes like COMSOL may enhance robustness at a

429 certain cost of accuracy. Thus, implementation capacity does not guarantee validity. Validity
430 must be carefully checked and argued with other comparable cases or with appropriate
431 convergence analysis.

432 Another targeted use of TReacLab concerns the development and test of new coupling 433 methods or strategies. Operator splitting can be performed with various methods including for 434 example adaptative time stepping (Belfort et al., 2007; Gasda et al., 2011). Global implicit 435 approaches that separate geochemical and transport software might also be more widely tested 436 providing the Jacobian of the chemical operator and taking into account current limitations 437 such as the difficulties to model precipitation/dissolution reactions (Amir and Kern, 2010). 438 TReacLab may then be used as a platform where interfaces to chemical and transport 439 operators are available and have been tested and documented for other coupling methods.

These applications are possible because TReacLab is a fully free and open software that can 440 be directly accessed and downloaded (https://github.com/TReacLab/TReacLab). The free and 441 442 open use of TReacLab has been dominant in its development and in the choices made for its 443 organization. The repository thus provides two main directories with sources and examples 444 respectively. Sources are organized in four main categories for chemistry, transport, coupler and utilitaries. At the root of the chemistry, transport and coupler directories are the virtual 445 446 classes as main entries. Examples of instantiations are provided in the subdirectories. 447 Additional developments may take advantage of the documented examples provided at the 448 different levels of the software.

#### 449 **6.** Conclusion

450 We provide in the TReacLab code a fully segmented implementation of the coupling of 451 independent geochemical and transport software. Coupling is based on a general expression of

452 the split-operator strategy with a set of classical methods. TReacLab should facilitate the development of reactive transport simulation capacities for independent reactive and transport 453 454 software. Systematic comparison to the well-established PHREEQC model for uniform 1D 455 reactive transport cases shows a good agreement with TReacLab. Systematic comparison 456 against COMSOL for the 2D problem shows that full decoupling at the implementation level 457 has a cost in accuracy. Sharp dissolution fronts of thermodynamically controlled reactions 458 especially are generally smoothed in split-operator strategies. Steeper fronts might be 459 recovered with smaller splitting time steps at larger computational costs. Beyond the 460 implementation and the simulation capacity, consistency and validity of the numerical models should be systematically assessed. TReacLab can be freely accessed and used to promote the 461 462 development of coupling methods and to provide additional modeling capacity for reactive transport coupling in geological media. 463

# 464 Appendix A: Implemented operator splitting methods

465 We detail the mathematical formulation for the sequential splitting (Geiser, 2009) :

$$\frac{\partial Z^1}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_1 Z^1, \qquad Z^1(x, t^n) = Z(x, t^n), \qquad t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \tag{A.1}$$

$$\frac{\partial Z^2}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_2 Z^2, \qquad Z^2(x, t^n) = Z^1(x, t^{n+1}), \qquad t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \tag{A.2}$$

$$Z(x, t^{n+1}) = Z^{2}(x, t^{n+1}),$$
(A.3)

466 the additive splitting (Faragó *et al.*, 2008a; Faragó *et al.*, 2008b) :

$$\frac{\partial Z^{1}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_{1} Z^{1}, \qquad Z^{1}(x, t^{n}) = Z(x, t^{n}), \qquad t^{n} \le t \le t^{n+1}, \qquad (A.4)$$

$$\frac{\partial Z^2}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_2 Z^2, \qquad Z^2(x, t^n) = Z(x, t^n), \qquad t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \qquad (A.5)$$

$$Z(x,t^{n+1}) = Z^{1}(x,t^{n+1}) + Z^{2}(x,t^{n+1}) - Z(x,t^{n}),$$
(A.6)

467 the Strang splitting (Strang, 1968) :

$$\frac{\partial Z^1}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_1 Z^1, \qquad Z^1(x, t^n) = Z(x, t^n), \qquad t^n \le t \le t^{n+1/2}, \qquad (A.7)$$

$$\frac{\partial Z^{2}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_{2} Z^{2}, \qquad Z^{2}(x, t^{n}) = Z^{1}(x, t^{n+1/2}), \qquad t^{n} \le t \le t^{n+1},$$
(A.8)

$$\frac{\partial Z^{1}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_{1} Z^{1}, \qquad Z^{1} \Big( x, t^{n+1/2} \Big) = Z^{2} \Big( x, t^{n+1} \Big), \quad t^{n+1/2} \le t \le t^{n+1}, \quad (A.9)$$

$$Z(x,t^{n+1}) = Z^{1}(x,t^{n+1}),$$
(A.10)

#### 468 and the symmetrically weighted splitting (SWS) (Csomós *et al.*, 2005) :

$$\frac{\partial Z^{1}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_{1} Z^{1}, \qquad Z^{1}(x, t^{n}) = Z(x, t^{n}), \qquad t^{n} \le t \le t^{n+1}, \qquad (A.11)$$

$$\frac{\partial Z^2}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_2 Z^2, \qquad Z^2(x, t^n) = Z^1(x, t^{n+1}), \qquad t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \quad (A.12)$$

$$\frac{\partial Z^{2*}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_2 Z^{2*}, \qquad Z^{2*}(x, t^n) = Z(x, t^n), \qquad t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \qquad (A.13)$$

$$\frac{\partial Z^{4*}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}_1 Z^{1*}, \qquad Z^{1*}(x, t^n) = Z^{2*}(x, t^{n+1}), \qquad t^n \le t \le t^{n+1}, \qquad (A.14)$$

$$Z(x, t^{n+1}) = \frac{Z^2(x, t^{n+1}) + Z^{1*}(x, t^{n+1})}{2}.$$
(A.15)

The alternating splitting algorithm (Valocchi and Malmstead, 1992) is based on a sequential
splitting. It is defined by two successive splitting time steps with a permutation of the operator
sequence between the splitting time steps.

### 472 Appendix B: Complementary notes on software organization

We successively describe the general toolbox organization, the coupler, transport and
chemistry classes. We concretely show how operator splitting methods can be introduced and
how other transport and geochemical codes can be connected.

#### 476 **B.1 Coupling methods**

477 The coupler is at the center of TReacLab as it performs the temporal integration and calls the 478 transport and chemistry solvers through the OS algorithm. In the pre-processing phase, it gets 479 the initial conditions and the temporal constrains of the integration. It is also in charge of

480 storing the required results before formatting and outputting them in the post-processing 481 phase. Because the coupler is at the core of the toolbox, its methods remain generic. 482 Interactions with the transport and chemistry solvers are also fully generic thanks to template interfaces calling external software and managing the exchange of information. Calling 483 484 external software relies on the so-called Solve Engine method for both transport and 485 chemistry software. Solve Engine takes as inputs the concentration data and the time step 486 over which the integration must be performed. It returns the updated concentrations, a flag to 487 check the success of the integration and an error message in case of failure to activate and 488 inform the error management procedure mentioned in the former section. The coupler is based 489 on a fixed structure of concentration data. Whatever the structure of concentrations in the 490 transport and chemical codes, the structure of concentrations within the coupler is always the 491 same. It consists in a matrix with in columns chemical species and in rows the position within 492 the domain (Figure B.1). The size of the matrix is equal to the number of cells times the number of chemical species and components passed through the coupler. Chemical species 493 494 include solutes and fixed species. As this is the sole link between the chemical code and the 495 coupler also in charge of temporary results storage for the post-processing, it must transfer all 496 quantities necessary for the algorithm and for the later extraction. The format of the matrix is 497 set in the pre-processing phase and it is fixed for the whole simulation. TReacLab does not 498 support yet any modification of species number to transfer between codes. Even if some 499 solute species are absent over some time of the simulation, they will be transferred. This 500 choice does not limit the capacity of the software as long as the chemical system is known 501 from the beginning but might have some consequences on its performance in cases where 502 solute composition strongly evolves. The choice of generality and flexibility, here like in 503 other places, has a cost in efficiency. All modifications of concentration format are eventually 504 performed in the interfaces between the coupler and the transport and chemistry solvers

V

505 (Figure 1).



506

Figure B.1: Concentration format internal to the coupler class. To ensure generality, this structure of concentration is always the same and does not depend on the external transport and chemistry software. Species concentration are given in columns and are passed to the transport software as such. Concentrations at given locations are stored in rows with both mobile and fixed species. They are transferred either line per line or globally to the chemistry software. Fixed species are transferred from the chemistry code to the coupler to enable their possible use in the post-processing phase for results and outputs.

Thanks to the template methods calling the transport and chemical solvers and to the generic concentration format, operator splitting methods can be simply implemented. These are not more than a combination of simple calls of solvers passing and updating concentration information. Several sequential non-iterative techniques have thus been implemented, as detailed in section 2.3.

519 Specifications of the coupler are thus the name of the coupling method necessary to switch to the corresponding method in the coupler class, the temporal constrains of the integration and a 520 521 vector of additional parameters. Temporal constrains of the integration are not only the initial and final times of the integration but also the times at which the solution must be stored. All 522 523 time related parameters are stored into a time class. Additional parameters may be tolerances 524 for example when using sequential iterative approaches. Instantiation of the coupler class thus 525 consists in providing the identifier of the chosen coupling technique, the time constrains in the 526 time class (initial time, final time, time to save the results, OS time step) and the additional parameters possibly needed by the algorithm. 527

### 528 **B.2 Geochemical solver**

Geochemical codes widely differ by their principles, the type of reactivity they consider and 529 530 their input/output formats and parameters. We propose to normalize some of their interface to 531 simplify exchanges with the coupler. In any case of equilibrium or kinetic reactions or of a mixed combination of them, geochemical codes steadily take concentrations, reaction 532 533 constants, rate parameters, reaction times, as inputs and return output concentrations. All 534 specifications linked to the choice of components, primary and secondary species should be set in the geochemical code or in the interface so that the geochemical solver does not have to 535 be modified and the coupler remains generic. Whether components are used or not, the 536 537 definition of the chemical system is not unique. Even when components are used, several 538 alternative and reliable definitions can be chosen (Fang et al., 2003; Hoffmann et al., 2012; 539 Molins et al., 2004). Numerical and conceptual consistencies between the transport and chemical systems should thus be ensured externally before any implementation. 540

541 While solute concentrations are instantiated by the coupler and systematically passed to the 542 geochemical solver, equilibrium and kinetic constants are considered as constant. They are

543 defined once for all in the pre-processing phase. For example in PHREEQC, chemical reactions and constants are already defined in databases like 'Phreeqc.dat' or 'llnl.dat'. 544 545 Initialization of mineral quantities is done at the beginning of the simulation when setting the initial conditions through the coupler. The interface between the coupler and the geochemical 546 547 solver is made up of the Solve Engine that calls the geochemical solver and the methods that modify the concentration format. By default, the geochemical solver is instantiated and stored 548 549 for each of the nodes of the computational grid for the whole domain of the simulation. Any 550 data that are not passed to the coupler is, in general, kept in the instances of the geochemical 551 code. Another option is provided by software that allow simultaneous computations for 552 several independent batches like it is for example the case of PHREEQC. In such cases only 553 one instance of the geochemical solver is necessary. Exchanges of data between the coupler 554 and the geochemical solver are defined in the pre-processing phase and remain fixed for the 555 whole duration of the simulation. It is precisely at this stage that components are derived through the algebraic operations of equation (6) and passed to the coupler. The coupler does 556 557 not manage the transformation of concentration and species but just their transfer between the 558 transport and geochemical solvers. The use of components does not fundamentally change the 559 calling sequence of the geochemical operator but modifies its interface to the coupler. Components may be specified by the geochemical code like in PHREEQC or by the user in 560 561 the pre-processing phase by loading the matrix of U (equation (6)). In this latter case, components are defined by the user in the pre-processing phase and are computed by the 562 interface that adapts the information to be passed through the coupler to the transport solver. 563

564 Connection of a new geochemical code requires essentially four operations. First, a new 565 daughter class of the template chemistry class must be defined. It can be built up using, as 566 template, one of the examples provided and described in the section 4. Second, an interface 567 must be created to filter the required information given from the coupler to the Solve\_Engine

568 method. Third, an instantiation procedure should be provided whether it is internal or external 569 to TReacLab. Fourth, the template Solve\_Engine calling function of the geochemical solver 570 must be written and optionally tested before being effectively used in reactive transport 571 problems.

#### 572 **B.3 Transport solver**

573 Despite the diversity of the transport mechanisms and numerical schemes to solve them, we 574 provide here a basic interface designed mostly to address transport in a generic way. As previously stated, this approach assumes that transport parameters are not modified by the 575 576 species concentration. This absence of feedback currently precludes density driven flows as well as permeability and porosity modifications due to precipitation or dissolution. TReacLab 577 might be extended in this direction on the basis of slow evolutions of porosity or density. The 578 579 transport operator relies on concentration independent parameters. We detail in the following 580 the interaction between the coupler and the transport classes with the exchange of data and the instantiation of the transport solver. We will conclude this section with the development 581 582 required to connect other transport codes.

583 While geochemical codes operate on species concentration on a given computational node, 584 transport codes operate on a given species concentration over all the domain. In terms of data 585 structure, each of the columns of the concentration array are successively transferred to the geochemical code and each of the rows (or linear combinations of rows) are given to the 586 587 transport code (Figure B.1). The transport operator is thus iteratively called for each of the 588 species or components explicitly specified in the interface between the coupler and the transport solver (Figure 1). The time range over which temporal integration should be 589 590 performed and the identifiers of the transported species are also transferred to the transport 591 solver. Species identification is essential when considering species sensitive diffusion

592 coefficient. The transport solver returns the updated concentration field at the final time of the 593 time range, an indicator of success or failure of the integration and a message to document 594 algorithm failures. The basic exchange of concentrations with the imposed integration times 595 are the sole requirements for the coupler to proceed.

596 All other parameters of the transport code should be set in the pre-processing phase, which may become an important part of the eventual reactive transport code. In fact it does not cover 597 598 only the flow and transport parameters but more broadly the full structure of the domain, of 599 the computational grid, and of the boundary conditions. As for the geochemical code, the transport code can be instantiated internally or externally. In case of internal definition, it 600 601 should contain at least the flow and transport properties, the morphology of the domain and the structure of the computational grid (coordinates of the computational nodes). A default set 602 603 of classes is provided for 1D problems as templates for the morphology (domain definitions), 604 the computational grid (identification and coordinates of nodes and edges), the boundary 605 conditions (nature and values for boundary conditions) and the hydraulic and transport properties. We recall as also said in section 2.2 that some operator splitting techniques might 606 607 impose limitations on the transport solver in terms of integration scheme or in terms of time 608 step (de Dieuleveult et al., 2009). Both the OS technique and the transport integration should 609 be chosen consistent.

Operations on the transport class are thus decomposed between the pre-processing and the processing phases. Specifications of the operator with all necessary parameters is performed in the pre-processing phase. Only generic exchanges of concentrations are needed in the processing phase. Additional information would generally be needed externally to identify the location of the computational nodes. More advanced information from the definition of the domain, parameters and boundary conditions will be generally defined in the transport code

rather than in TReacLab. For example, Comsol or Modflow have their own grid definitions. They are complete and efficient. It may be straightforwardly extracted and cross-referenced with the results of TReacLab as long as the cell numbers correspond, a basic but necessary requirement. This choice is motivated by both the generality and the simplicity of TReacLab. It also highlights that TReacLab remains a coupler that transfers information and does not process in any way the relation of concentrations between cells like a transport operator does.

622 The methodological choice of handling the spatial dimension of the problem within the transport operator is not only operational. It is also ensuring the capacity to connect a wide 623 624 range of transport codes with their own logic and structure. For example, the multi-physics 625 software COMSOL has its own mesh generator methods and internal structures that should not be duplicated in TReacLab but interfaced. Connecting other codes would thus require 626 627 reduced work as long as they can already be called from the same environment of 628 development (here MATLAB) on a discretized time basis. More in details, any new transport 629 code would require: 1) the development of the main calling function Solve\_Engine to call it from the coupler 2) the adaptation of the concentration format in the interface methods that 630 631 match the concentrations to the internal data structure of the external code, 3) the instantiation 632 of the transport class and 4) the access to the coordinates of the computational nodes for outputs purposes. As for the geochemical code, implementation of the interface should be 633 checked before any full reactive transport coupling. This can be completed within TReacLab 634 by using an idle process instead of the geochemical code. 635

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge ANDRA and the ANR project H2MNO4 under the
number ANR-12-MONU0012-01 for their financial support, Jocelyne Erhel and David L.
Parkhurst for constant and fruitful discussions, and Javier Molinero for initial exchanges.

#### 640 **References**

- Abarca, E., Nardi, A., Grandia, F., Molinero, J., 2013. Feedback between reactive transport
  and convective flow during CO2 migration in a saline aquifer, EGU General
  Assembly Conference Abstracts, p. 7707.
- Amir, L., Kern, M., 2010. A global method for coupling transport with chemistry in
   heterogeneous porous media. Computational Geosciences 14, 465-481.
- Apoung-Kamga, J.-B., Have, P., Houot, J., Kern, M., Semin, A., 2009. Reactive Transport in
  Porous Media. ESAIM: Proceedings 28, 227 245.
- Azad, V.J., Li, C., Verba, C., Ideker, J.H., Isgor, O.B., 2016. A COMSOL–GEMS interface
  for modeling coupled reactive-transport geochemical processes. Computers &
  Geosciences 92, 79-89.
- Barry, D.A., Miller, C.T., Culligan-Hensley, P.J., 1996. Temporal discretisation errors in non iterative split-operator approaches to solving chemical reaction/groundwater transport
   models. Journal of Contaminant Hydrology 22, 1-17.
- Bea, S.A., Carrera, J., Ayora, C., Batlle, F., Saaltink, M.W., 2009. CHEPROO: A Fortran 90
  object-oriented module to solve chemical processes in Earth Science models.
  Computers & Geosciences 35, 1098-1112.
- 657 Bear, J., 1972. Dynamics of fluids in porous media. Elsevier, New York.
- Belfort, B., Carrayrou, J., Lehmann, F., 2007. Implementation of Richardson extrapolation in
  an efficient adaptive time stepping method: applications to reactive transport and
  unsaturated flow in porous media. Transport in Porous Media 69, 123-138.

- Bethke, C.M., 2007. Geochemical and biogeochemical reaction modeling. Cambridge
  University Press.
- Beyer, C., Li, D., De Lucia, M., Kühn, M., Bauer, S., 2012. Modelling CO2-induced fluid–
  rock interactions in the Altensalzwedel gas reservoir. Part II: coupled reactive
  transport simulation. Environmental Earth Sciences 67, 573-588.
- 666 Carrayrou, J., Mosé, R., Behra, P., 2004. Operator-splitting procedures for reactive transport
  667 and comparison of mass balance errors. Journal of Contaminant Hydrology 68, 239668 268.
- Charlton, S.R., Parkhurst, D.L., 2011. Modules based on the geochemical model PHREEQC
  for use in scripting and programming languages. Computers & Geosciences 37, 16531663.
- 672 Clement, T.P., Sun, Y., Hooker, B.S., Petersen, J.N., 1998. Modeling Multispecies Reactive
  673 Transport in Ground Water. Ground Water Monitoring & Remediation 18, 79-92.
- 674 Commend, S., Zimmermann, T., 2001. Object-oriented nonlinear finite element
   675 programming: a primer. Advances in Engineering Software 32, 611-628.
- 676 COMSOL, A., 2010. COMSOL Multiphysics-LiveLink for Matlab User's Guide, comsol 4.1
  677 edition.
- 678 COMSOL, A., 2012. 4.3 User's Guide. Comsol.
- 679 Csomós, P., Faragó, I., 2008. Error analysis of the numerical solution of split differential
  680 equations. Mathematical and Computer Modelling 48, 1090-1106.
- Csomós, P., Faragó, I., Havasi, Á., 2005. Weighted sequential splittings and their analysis.
  Computers & Mathematics with Applications 50, 1017-1031.

- de Dieuleveult, C., Erhel, J., 2010. A global approach to reactive transport: application to the
  MoMas benchmark. Computational Geosciences 14, 451-464.
- de Dieuleveult, C., Erhel, J., Kern, M., 2009. A global strategy for solving reactive transport
  equations. Journal of Computational Physics 228, 6395-6410.
- Diersch, H.-J.G., 1996. Interactive, graphics-based finite-element simulation system
  FEFLOW for modeling groundwater flow, contaminant mass and heat transport
  processes. WASY Institute for Water Resource Planning and System Research Ltd.,
  Berlin, Germany.
- Engesgaard, P., Kipp, K.L., 1992. A geochemical transport model for redox-controlled
  movement of mineral fronts in groundwater flow systems: A case of nitrate removal
  by oxidation of pyrite. Water Resources Research 28, 2829-2843.
- Fang, Y., Yeh, G.-T., Burgos, W.D., 2003. A general paradigm to model reaction-based
  biogeochemical processes in batch systems. Water Resources Research 39, 1083.
- Faragó, I., Gnandt, B., Havasi, Á., 2008a. Additive and iterative operator splitting methods
  and their numerical investigation. Computers & Mathematics with Applications 55,
  2266-2279.
- Faragó, I., Thomsen, P.G., Zlatev, Z., 2008b. On the additive splitting procedures and their
  computer realization. Applied Mathematical Modelling 32, 1552-1569.
- Friedly, J.C., Rubin, J., 1992. Solute transport with multiple equilibrium-controlled or
  kinetically controlled chemical reactions. Water Resources Research 28, 1935-1953.
- Gasda, S.E., Farthing, M.W., Kees, C.E., Miller, C.T., 2011. Adaptive split-operator methods
- for modeling transport phenomena in porous medium systems. Advances in Water
  Resources 34, 1268-1282.

- Geiser, J., 2009. Decomposition methods for differential equations: theory and applications.
   CRC Press.
- Hammond, G., Lichtner, P., Lu, C., Mills, R., 2012. Pflotran: reactive flow & transport code
  for use on laptops to leadership-class supercomputers. Groundwater reactive transport
  models, 141-159.
- Hammond, G.E., Lichtner, P.C., Mills, R.T., 2014. Evaluating the performance of parallel
  subsurface simulators: An illustrative example with PFLOTRAN. Water Resources
  Research 50, 208-228.
- 714 Hoffmann, J., Kräutle, S., Knabner, P., 2010. A parallel global-implicit 2-D solver for reactive
- transport problems in porous media based on a reduction scheme and its application to
  the MoMaS benchmark problem. Computational Geosciences 14, 421-433.
- Hoffmann, J., Kräutle, S., Knabner, P., 2012. A general reduction scheme for reactive
  transport in porous media. Computational Geosciences 16, 1081-1099.
- Hundsdorfer, W., Verwer, J.G., 2013. Numerical solution of time-dependent advectiondiffusion-reaction equations. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Kazemi Nia Korrani, A., Sepehrnoori, K., Delshad, M., 2015. Coupling IPhreeqc with
  UTCHEM to model reactive flow and transport. Computers & Geosciences 82, 152169.
- Kazemi Nia Korrani, A., Sepehrnoori, K., Delshad, M., 2016. A Mechanistic Integrated
  Geochemical and Chemical-Flooding Tool for Alkaline/Surfactant/Polymer Floods.
  SPE Journal 21, 32-54.

- Kool, J., Van Genuchten, M.T., 1991. Hydrus: One-dimensional Variably Saturated Flow and
   Transport Model, Including Hysteresis and Root Water Uptake; Version 3.3. US
   Salinity Laboratory.
- Kräutle, S., Knabner, P., 2005. A new numerical reduction scheme for fully coupled
  multicomponent transport-reaction problems in porous media. Water Resources
  Research 41, W09414.
- Kulik, D.A., Wagner, T., Dmytrieva, S.V., Kosakowski, G., Hingerl, F.F., Chudnenko, K.V.,
  Berner, U.R., 2013. GEM-Selektor geochemical modeling package: revised algorithm
  and GEMS3K numerical kernel for coupled simulation codes. Computational
  Geosciences 17, 1-24.
- Lie, K., 2014. An introduction to reservoir simulation using MATLAB: User guide for the
  Matlab reservoir simulation toolbox (MRST), SINTEF ICT, Department of Applied
  Mathematics, Oslo, Norway.
- Liu, J., Ewing, R.E., 2005. An Operator Splitting Method for Nonlinear Reactive Transport
  Equations and Its Implementation Based on DLL and COM, In: Zhang, W., Tong, W.,
  Chen, Z., Glowinski, R. (Eds.), Current Trends in High Performance Computing and
  Its Applications: Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance
  Computing and Applications, August 8–10, 2004, Shanghai, P.R. China. Springer
  Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 93-102.
- Marty, N.C.M., Munier, I., Gaucher, E.C., Tournassat, C., Gaboreau, S., Vong, C.Q., Giffaut,
  E., Cochepin, B., Claret, F., 2014. Simulation of Cement/Clay Interactions: Feedback
  on the Increasing Complexity of Modelling Strategies. Transport in Porous Media 104,
  385-405.

- Mayer, K., 2000. MIN3P V1. 0 User Guide. University of Waterloo, Department of Earth
  Sciences 26.
- McDonald, M.G., Harbaugh, A.W., 1988. A modular three-dimensional finite-difference
  ground-water flow model, In: Survey, U.S.G. (Ed.), Denver, Colorado.
- MIKE(DHI), 2016. piChem: A FEFLOW Plugin for Advanced Geochemical Reactions, User
  Guide.
- Molins, S., Carrera, J., Ayora, C., Saaltink, M.W., 2004. A formulation for decoupling
  components in reactive transport problems. Water Resources Research 40, W10301.
- Morel, F.M., Hering, J.G., 1993. Principles and applications of aquatic chemistry. John Wiley
  & Sons.
- Multiphysics, C., 2008. Pesticide transport and reaction in soil. Earth Science Module ModelLibrary.
- Muniruzzaman, M., Rolle, M., 2016. Modeling multicomponent ionic transport in
  groundwater with IPhreeqc coupling: Electrostatic interactions and geochemical
  reactions in homogeneous and heterogeneous domains. Advances in Water Resources
  98, 1-15.
- Nardi, A., Idiart, A., Trinchero, P., de Vries, L.M., Molinero, J., 2014. Interface COMSOL PHREEQC (iCP), an efficient numerical framework for the solution of coupled
   multiphysics and geochemistry. Computers & Geosciences 69, 10-21.
- Nasir, O., Fall, M., Evgin, E., 2014. A simulator for modeling of porosity and permeability
  changes in near field sedimentary host rocks for nuclear waste under climate change
  influences. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology 42, 122-135.

772	Parkhurst, D.L., Appelo, C., 1999. User's guide to PHREEQC (Version 2): A compute
773	program for speciation, batch-reaction, one-dimensional transport, and inverse
774	geochemical calculations.

- Parkhurst, D.L., Kipp, K.L., Engesgaard, P., Charlton, S.R., 2004. PHAST, a program for
  simulating ground-waterflow, solute transport, and multicomponent geochemical
  reactions. USGS Techniques and Methods 6, A8.
- Parkhurst, D.L., Wissmeier, L., 2015. PhreeqcRM: A reaction module for transport simulators
  based on the geochemical model PHREEQC. Advances in Water Resources 83, 176189.
- Patel, R., Perko, J., Jacques, D., De Schutter, G., Ye, G., Van Breugel, K., 2013. Lattice
  Boltzmann based multicomponent reactive transport model coupled with geochemical
  solver for scale simulations, 5th International Conference on Computational Methods
  for Coupled Problems in Science and Engineering. International Center for Numerical
  Methods in Engineering (CIMNE), pp. 806-817.
- 786 Peterson, S., Hostetler, C., Deutsch, W., Cowan, C., 1987. MINTEQ user's manual. Pacific
- 787 Northwest Lab., Richland, WA (USA); Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington,
  788 DC (USA). Div. of Waste Management.
- Prommer, H., Davis, G., Barry, D., 1999. PHT3D—A three-dimensional biogeochemical
  transport model for modelling natural and enhanced remediation. Contaminated Site
  Remediation: Challenges Posed by Urban and Industrial Contaminants. Centre for
  Groundwater Studies, Fremantle, Western Australia, 351-358.
- Pruess, K., Oldenburg, C., Moridis, G., 1999. TOUGH2 user's guide version 2. Lawrence
  Berkeley National Laboratory.
- 795 Register, A.H., 2007. A guide to MATLAB object-oriented programming. CRC Press.

- Rouson, D., Xia, J., Xu, X., 2011. Scientific software design: the object-oriented way.
  Cambridge University Press.
- Saaltink, M.W., Ayora, C., Carrera, J., 1998. A mathematical formulation for reactive
  transport that eliminates mineral concentrations. Water Resources Research 34, 16491656.
- Saaltink, M.W., Carrera, J., Ayora, C., 2001. On the behavior of approaches to simulate
  reactive transport. Journal of Contaminant Hydrology 48, 213-235.
- Saaltink, M.W., Yakirevich, A., Carrera, J., Ayora, C., 2011. Fluid flow, solute and heat
  transport equations. Geochemical Modeling of Groundwater, Vadose and Geothermal
  Systems, 83.
- Simpson, M.J., Landman, K.A., 2008. Theoretical analysis and physical interpretation of
  temporal truncation errors in operator split algorithms. Mathematics and Computers in
  Simulation 77, 9-21.
- Šimůnek, J., Jacques, D., Van Genuchten, M.T., Mallants, D., 2006. Multicomponent
  geochemical transport modeling using HYDRUS-1D and HP1. J. Am. Water Resour.
  Assoc 42, 1537-1547.
- Šimůnek, J., Vogel, T., Van Genuchten, M.T., 1994. The SWMS-2D code for simulating
  water and solute transport in two dimensional variably saturated media–Version 1.2.
  Research Report 132, US Salinity Lab., Agric. Res. Serv. USDA, Riverside,
  California, USA.
- Skeel, R.D., Berzins, M., 1990. A method for the spatial discretization of parabolic equations
  in one space variable. SIAM journal on scientific and statistical computing 11, 1-32.

- Steefel, C., 2009. CrunchFlow software for modeling multicomponent reactive flow and
  transport. User's manual. Earth Sciences Division. Lawrence Berkeley, National
  Laboratory, Berkeley, CA. October, 12-91.
- Steefel, C.I., DePaolo, D.J., Lichtner, P.C., 2005. Reactive transport modeling: An essential
  tool and a new research approach for the Earth sciences. Earth and Planetary Science
  Letters 240, 539-558.
- Steefel, C.I., MacQuarrie, K.T., 1996. Approaches to modeling of reactive transport in porous
  media. Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry 34, 85-129.
- Strang, G., 1968. On the construction and comparison of difference schemes. SIAM Journal
  on Numerical Analysis 5, 506-517.
- Thouvenot, P., Bildstein, O., Munier, I., Cochepin, B., Poyet, S., Bourbon, X., Treille, E.,
  2013. Modeling of concrete carbonation in deep geological disposal of intermediate
  level waste, EPJ Web of Conferences. EDP Sciences, p. 05004.
- Trotignon, L., Devallois, V., Peycelon, H., Tiffreau, C., Bourbon, X., 2007. Predicting the
  long term durability of concrete engineered barriers in a geological repository for
  radioactive waste. Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C 32, 259-274.
- Valocchi, A.J., Malmstead, M., 1992. Accuracy of operator splitting for advection-dispersionreaction problems. Water Resources Research 28, 1471-1476.
- 836 Van der Lee, J., 2002. CHESS Software for Geochemistry. Hydrology and Environmental
  837 Science, École des Mines de Paris, Fontainebleau, France.
- van der Lee, J., De Windt, L., Lagneau, V., Goblet, P., 2003. Module-oriented modeling of
  reactive transport with HYTEC. Computers & Geosciences 29, 265-275.

840	Van Genuchten, M.T., Alves, W.,	1982. <i>A</i>	Analytical	solutions	of the	one-dimensio	nal
841	convective-dispersive solute	transpor	t equation	n. United	States	Department	of
842	Agriculture, Economic Resear	ch Servic	e.				

- Wissmeier, L., Barry, D.A., 2011. Simulation tool for variably saturated flow with
  comprehensive geochemical reactions in two- and three-dimensional domains.
  Environmental Modelling & Software 26, 210-218.
- Yeh, G.T., Tripathi, V.S., 1989. A critical evaluation of recent developments in
  hydrogeochemical transport models of reactive multichemical components. Water
  Resources Research 25, 93-108.
- 849 Zhang, F., 2012. Groundwater reactive transport models. Bentham Science Publishers.
- 850 Zheng, C., Wang, P.P., 1999. MT3DMS: a modular three-dimensional multispecies transport
- 851 model for simulation of advection, dispersion, and chemical reactions of contaminants
- 852 in groundwater systems; documentation and user's guide. DTIC Document.

# Highlights

- Object-oriented implementation of non-intrusive couplings for reactive transport
- Validation for 3 equilibrium and kinetically controlled 1D cases with PhreeqC and one 2D case with COMSOL.
- Illustration of implementation flexibility with different transport and reaction codes