When Cubic Law and Darcy Fail: Correcting Model Misspecification in Fracture Conductivities

Sarah Perez^{*,a}, Florian Doster^b, Julien Maes^b, Hannah Menke^b, Ahmed ElSheikh^b, and Andreas Busch^a

^aThe Lyell Centre, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK ^bInstitute of GeoEnergy Engineering, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK

March 28, 2025

Abstract

Uncertainties in the subsurface pose challenges for a reliable assessment of leakage risks and ensuring the long-term integrity of CO₂ storage. Fault zones, characterised by multi-scale heterogeneities, are critical pathways for CO2 leakage and suffer from significant data uncertainties due to unresolved structural features. Understanding the multi-scale uncertainties in estimating fracture network conductivity is therefore essential for mitigating leakage risks and ensuring reliable modelling of upscaled fault leakage rates. However, current models fail to capture all fault zone heterogeneity, particularly neglecting the effects of fracture surface roughness on fluid migration. Simplified assumptions, such as the Cubic Law based on mechanical aperture measurements, lead to erroneous models known as model misspecifications and introduce modelling uncertainty in leakage predictions. Here, we develop an AI-driven quantification framework to address data uncertainties and correct model misspecifications in estimating fracture conductivities. By automatically integrating small-scale uncertainties, including fracture surface roughness, and leveraging their interactions across scales, we improve upon traditional empirical corrections. We combine physics-based constraints with adaptive, data-driven and geometric corrections to infer the hydraulic aperture governing fluid flow in fractures with varying roughness. This approach generates reliable local permeability maps that account for roughness effects and discrepancies between mechanical and hydraulic apertures, accurately reflecting overall fracture conductivity. By propagating uncertainties from individual fractures to network scales, our approach will support robust calibration of conductivity ranges for fault leakage sensitivity analyses, not only resolving uncertainties in fracture-scale modelling but also enabling efficient integration into larger-scale simulations to enhance predictions for subsurface CO₂ storage.

Keywords: Machine Learning, Uncertainty Quantification, CO₂ storage, Fault Leakage.

Significance Statement

Safely storing CO_2 in the subsurface is crucial for mitigating climate change, but predicting potential leakage through fault zones remains challenging due to uncertainties in subsurface structures. Fault zones are complex, with small-scale features significantly affecting fluid flow yet often ignored in current models. This study develops an AI-powered framework to address these uncertainties, combining data-driven corrections with physics-based insights to estimate fracture conductivity more accurately. By capturing the effects of fracture roughness and propagating their uncertainties to network scales, the approach aims to improve predictions of leakage risks. This work will help bridge the gap between small-scale fracture details and large-scale fault models, enhancing the reliability of CO_2 storage simulations and contributing to safer, more sustainable climate solutions.

1 Introduction

Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) is a mature technology that will support the decarbonisation of energy intensive industries and mitigate the impact of global warming [1, 2]. However, despite the presence of low-permeability seals, CO_2 leakage along wells and the geological overburden remains a low, yet unquantified risk. Therefore, leakage risk assessment remains critical to ensure safe subsurface storage of CO_2 . One potential source of leakage are geological features such as faults and fractures that compromise the structural integrity of the seals [3, 4]. Fault damage zones, potentially involving networks of fractures, can create highly conductive pathways that facilitate fluid migration. Investigating the impact of potential faultrelated leakage is thus essential for de-risking CCS operations.

The presence of fault and fracture damage zones renders the modelling of transport, geochemical, and geomechanical processes more challenging. The multi-scale interactions between the fault zone and the surrounding porous matrix (protolith), especially their heterogeneity in terms of conductivity, lead to vast ranges of scales for fluid migration rates. Fault zones are geologically complex, consisting of a low-permeability fault

^{*}Corresponding author: S.Perez@hw.ac.uk

core surrounded by a fractured damage zone, which involves fracture networks that significantly contribute to the overall conductivity [3]. The conductivity of this damage zone, *i.e.*, its ability to let fluid flow through the network of fractures, is governed by a complex interplay of individual permeability, connectivity and density [5]. Various factors contribute to the modelling of fault-related leakage, including fracture flow rate, mass transfer between the fault inherent fractures and the matrix, mechanical stress (and changes thereof), or geochemical reactions [6, 7, 8].

In addition to these modelling challenges, significant structural uncertainties arise from missing geological features in the characterisation of fault damage zones. Sub-seismic fractures (*i.e.*, below the limits of seismic resolution) introduce variabilities in their distribution and properties within the fault zone [9, 10, 11]. These undetectable features can affect reservoir quality by critically influencing fluid flow and further complicate the modelling of CO₂ leakage at the reservoir-caprock scale [12]. Sensitivity analyses are commonly employed to mitigate this issue and evaluate how the variability associated with structural uncertainties affects leakage rates. However, the parametrisation of geological distributions, including the hand-tuning of properties such as fracture network geometry and hydraulic conductivity, is often left to reservoir engineers [13, 14]. Providing reliable calibration data for sensitivity analyses is therefore essential and requires a careful consideration of geological uncertainties within subsurface formations.

However, uncertainties arising at smaller scales are often overlooked in the calibration of probabilistic distributions for larger-scale sensitivity analyses, while their effects remain poorly understood. Several key questions thus remain largely unexplored: Can we achieve a reliable calibration of faultconductivity distributions through a meaningful analysis of uncertainties across different scales? Can we develop a framework that integrates both structural and modelling uncertainties at the individual fracture scale and effectively propagates them to fault leakage rate distributions? The current research aligns with this perspective and establishes the first fundamental step toward developing an upscaling strategy for reliably assessing uncertainties related to CO_2 fault leakage.

We propose leveraging the interplay between different scales - individual fractures, fracture networks, and fault zones - to better understand how these uncertainties propagate across scales. In particular, conductivity remains sensitive to local geometric characteristics, such as aperture distribution and roughness of individual fractures [15, 16]. However, several modelling approximations commonly assume smooth, parallel fracture walls and neglect the smaller scales uncertainties, such as roughness patterns. This includes the Cubic Law approximation based on the average mechanical aperture, which refers to the average structural width of the gap between two fracture walls. The latter can significantly differ from the hydraulic aperture (i.e., the effective width of the fracture contributing to fluid flow) and induce discrepancies in estimating fracture permeability. Moreover, most of the model corrections of the Cubic Law proposed in the literature remain

empirical and highly parametrised, rendering their application to realistic fracture networks even more difficult [17, 18, 19]. We refer to this as modelling misspecifications, as the models inaccurately represent the real-world system due to incorrect assumptions and/or measurement errors. This can lead to erroneous or biased predictions, further reducing the reliability of conductivity estimates at both the fracture network and fault zone scales. Uncertainties associated with such model misspecifications thus need to be investigated across the different scales to support decision-making with respect to fault-related leakage [9].

Here, we aim at reliably addressing concerns in modelling fracture conductivity by coupling physics-based and datadriven approaches within the probabilistic machine learning framework developed in Perez et al. [20]. We propose an automatic and geometric correction of previous model misspecifications to infer the latent (*i.e.*, not directly observable) hydraulic aperture, along with its uncertainties. The mechanical aperture field represents, by definition, a structural upper limit for the hydraulic aperture. However, since the hydraulic aperture is a hypothetical concept related to fluid flow, it cannot be measured directly in fracture geometries, unlike the mechanical aperture. Therefore, we develop a proxy for the hydraulic aperture such that the reconstructed field explains the overall flow behaviour and effective permeability by accounting for the roughness effects of fractures. Leveraging local corrections based on fracture geometries benefits from enhanced generalisation compared to empirical corrections, thereby allowing for robust future upscaling at the fracture network scale. Correction of the model misspecifications is achieved through a multi-objective formulation of the Bayesian inference problem, using data on mechanical apertures - either from synthetic or realistic fracture geometries obtained via X-ray microtomography — and a physics-based constraint which acts as a regularisation at the small scales. This correction characterises the local relative roughness, which allows for adaptive quantification of how the hydraulic aperture deviates from the mean mechanical aperture and the Cubic Law model thereof. Finally, the physics-based constraint ensures that this geometric correction yields a local permeability field whose arithmetic mean aligns with the upscaled Stokes permeability of the fracture, which represents the effective permeability. We apply the method to several synthetic fractures, presenting the same (arithmetic) mean mechanical aperture but varying surface roughness. Our approach provides accurate estimates of the relevant hydraulic aperture fields and fracture conductivity, where both the Cubic Law and Darcy approximation fail. Our main contributions can be summarised as follows, and align with the progression of the manuscript:

 In the first section, we show that using the mechanical aperture field, either globally with the Cubic Law or locally through Darcy flow-based upscaling, neglects roughness effects and fails to provide reliable fracture conductivity. This is highlighted in simple synthetic fracture geometries, which further queries the validity of these models when applied to complex fracture networks. Therefore, we intend to provide a reliable method for correcting these model misspecifications at the individual fracture scale, with the overarching goal of integrating it into fracture networks and thereby addressing the propagation of uncertainties from the smallest scales.

- We propose such a framework for automatic and datadriven correction of model misspecification in fracture conductivities, in the second section of this manuscript. Unlike empirical alternatives in the literature, our approach leverages physical priors and geometric insights that can subsequently be upscaled to the fracture network scale.
- This will lead to a robust extension of our methodology to complex fracture networks. Indeed, our approach produces local hydraulic aperture and permeability maps that are consistent with the effective fracture permeability obtained by upscaling the Stokes equation at small scales. Inferring several local, corrected permeability maps at the individual fracture scale is a significant advantage. These maps can be integrated into fracture network geometries and directly used in Darcy flow upscaling, as further described in Discussion, providing more reliable estimates of fracture network conductivity compared to Darcy upscaling based on direct mechanical aperture measurements. Finally, by propagating uncertainties from the smallest scale, we can provide reliable calibration data with known confidence intervals for the hydraulic conductivity of a fracture network, thereby enabling meaningful sensitivity analyses of leakage rates at the fault-zone scale.

2 Model misspecifications in fracture conductivity

X-ray microtomography scans (μ CT) usually provide a description of fracture networks at the core scale. However, unlike porous media samples, where a representative elementary volume can be easily extracted from the core scale, fracture networks usually require a combination of high image resolution to capture multi-scale fractures ---- and distinguish them from the surrounding porous matrix — and a large field of view to ensure a sufficiently representative fracture network. The μ CT dataset can span billions of pixels, rendering Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS) of flow within the entire fracture network challenging while being the most reliable estimate of conductivity. Flow-based evaluation of permeability, obtained by fully resolving the Navier-Stokes or Stokes equations (depending on the flow regime) within the 3D fracture network geometry, is often impractical due to the substantial computational time and resources required. As a result, modelling alternatives based on geometrical measurements of the mechanical aperture a_m are often considered to estimate flow properties. This method can introduce significant inaccuracies due to model misspecifications that, in turn, affect the uncertainty estimates. The impacts

of these modelling uncertainties are discussed in this section on a simple synthetic fracture dataset with varying roughness.

2.1 Fracture dataset with varying roughness

Synthetic fracture geometries are obtained from the Digital Rock Physics portal [21] and produced with SynFrac, a fracture generation software that relies on natural analogues [22]. Four fractures with dimensions of $256 \times 128 \times 30$ units were generated with an isotropic resolution of $\delta x = 3.94 \,\mu m$ and a common average mechanical aperture $\langle a_m \rangle$ of $50 \,\mu m$. The notation $\langle a_m \rangle$ refers to the arithmetic mean of the 2D mechanical aperture field $a_m(x, y)$, describing the fracture width in the z direction for each point $(x, y) \in \Omega^{2D}$, with Ω^{2D} the 2D projection of the fracture domain. The arithmetic mean is thus defined as:

$$\langle a_m \rangle = \frac{1}{|\Omega^{2D}|} \int_{\Omega^{2D}} a_m(x, y) dx dy.$$
 (1)

The fracture walls present varying and increasing roughnesses, which are characterised by their Joint Roughness Coefficients (JRCs) ranging from 4.86 to 10.31. This parameter is commonly used to quantify fracture roughness, where a rougher surface corresponds to a higher JRC value. Here, the JRCs are not employed as a roughness correction tool; they are primarily provided as a guideline and estimated using the relation from [23]

$$JRC = 98.718Z_2^{1.6833},\tag{2}$$

where Z_2 is the root mean square of the first derivative of the fracture profiles, as proposed by Myers [24]. More details on the generation of this specific fracture dataset can be found in Guiltinan *et al.* [25]. The fracture profiles are finally corrupted with Gaussian noise to mimic a μ CT dataset, which can suffer from edge enhancement and blurred interface artefacts [26].

This fracture dataset holds significant value for validating our corrective approach. First, considering portions or subvolumes of fracture geometries within a small field of view (with a spatial grid resolution of $256 \times 128 \times 30$ in this case) allows for fast and efficient evaluations of the effective permeability, denoted as K_{NS} . The latter is obtained from solving the incompressible Stokes equation in Ω^{3D} , the realistic 3D fracture domain as presented in Figures 3 and 4B, with adherent boundary conditions on the fracture walls. Indeed, the fracture permeability can be determined from the pore-scale velocity within the subvolume, via the direct numerical method developed in [27] (see Appendix A). In this case, the contribution of the surrounding porous matrix to the estimation of fracture conductivity is, however, neglected. This stands as a common assumption in reservoir-scale simulations of faultrelated leakage, essentially due to different time scales of fluid migration rates in the porous matrix (which is significantly less permeable) compared to the main fracture network. In the sequel, the effective permeability evaluations obtained from direct fluid flow modelling serve as the ground truth for the various JRCs. Finally, this dataset allows us to highlight that the Cubic Law approximation and Darcy flow upscaling, when



Figure 1. 2D slice, taken along the direction $y = 197 \,\mu m$, of the rough fracture #4 with JRC = 10.31. The full 3D geometry of this fracture is represented in Figure 4B. This schematic illustrates how the hydraulic aperture field $a_h(x, y)$ can differ from the geometrically measured mechanical aperture field $a_m(x, y)$ due to surface roughness. The two horizontal dashed lines represent the parallel planes of the fracture geometry corresponding to the Cubic Law approximation, with the mean mechanical aperture $\langle a_m \rangle$.

based on the mechanical aperture a_m , are inadequate for capturing the roughness effects. In particular, it tends to overestimate the hydraulic conductivity of the four distinct fractures compared to the effective permeability K_{NS} . These aspects are investigated in the following section.

2.2 Cubic Law and Darcy flow upscaling

The empirical Cubic Law serves as the primary modelling approximation for estimating fracture permeability. This law establishes the fracture permeability, denoted as K_{CL} , based on the arithmetic average mechanical aperture $\langle a_m \rangle$, as defined by Eq. (1), through the relation

$$K_{CL} = \frac{\langle a_m \rangle^2}{12}.$$
 (3)

This approach assumes smooth and parallel fracture walls with no roughness and raises questions about the validity of the Cubic Law approximation for realistic fracture geometries, especially considering the discrepancies that roughness can induce between the mechanical and hydraulic apertures [15] (see Figure 1). Furthermore, the Cubic Law implies that conductivity is independent of the flow direction, *i.e.*, it assumes the fracture to be isotropic, which does not hold in realistic geometries. The different fractures in the dataset exhibit a constant permeability approximation given by the Cubic Law Eq. (3), as $K_{CL} = 208.33 \,\mu m^2$. However, flow-based estimations performed through DNS in Ω^{3D} (see Appendix A) highlight non-negligible deviations in the effective fracture permeability K_{NS} for the different JRCs. These deviations range from approximately 6% to 16% depending on the roughness (see Table 1 and Figure 6 in Appendix A for further details).

While the global behaviour of the Cubic Law approximation — averaged over the entire subvolume — represents a major modelling misspecification, we also investigated a more



Figure 2. Comparison of fracture permeability estimates from different modelling assumptions for various roughness patterns identified by their JRCs, highlighting both modelling misspecifications and correction. The respective models include direct Cubic Law approximation K_{CL} based on the (arithmetic) mean of the mechanical aperture $\langle a_m \rangle$ and represented by the horizontal red dashed line; Darcy flow upscaling $K_D^{a_m}$, based on the 2D mechanical aperture map; Stokes upscaling K_{NS} , based on the actual fracture geometry Ω^{3D} and which acts as the groundtruth; and the automatic Bayesian PINN correction, which provides an upscaled mean estimate (represented by the blue dots) with associated uncertainty ranges based on $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$. The detailed values for each corresponding modelling assumption are provided in Table 1.

reasonable alternative that assumes local validity of the Cubic Law. The latter considers the local mechanical aperture field $a_m(x, y)$ (see Figure 1) to derive a corresponding permeability map for each point $(x, y) \in \Omega^{2D}$, such that:

$$K_{CL}^{a_m}(x,y) = \frac{a_m(x,y)^2}{12}.$$
(4)

An estimation of the fracture permeability can, therefore, be obtained through Darcy flow-based upscaling, given the 2D local permeability field from Eq. (4). This alternative offers the benefit of considering flow direction in the evaluation of conductivity, unlike the global Cubic Law in Eq. (3). The permeability estimates resulting from the 2D Darcy upscaling, denoted here $K_D^{a_m}$, are computed using the MATLAB Reservoir Simulation Toolbox (MRST) for single-phase flow [28]. Details on the modelling approximation and numerical solver are given in Appendix B. The Darcy permeability values $K_D^{a_m}$ are then compared with both the global Cubic Law approximation and the effective Stokes permeability for the different JRCs. The results are summarised in Table 1 and highlight that the local Cubic Law modelling alternative Eq. (4) combined with Darcy upscaling tend to reduce the overestimation on the fracture permeability, compared to K_{CL} . Nonetheless, we still observe in Figure 2 notable deviations in $K_D^{a_m}$ compared to the effective fracture permeability K_{NS} , which range from

Roughness	Cubic Law	Darcy	(Navier) Stokes	Bayesian PINN		
JRC	K_{CL}	$K_{CL} ext{ } K_D^{a_m} ext{ } K_{NS} ext{ } Mean ext{ on } K_M$		Mean on $K_{NN}^{a_h}$	UQ on $K_{NN}^{a_h}$	
/	μm^2	μm^2	μm^2	μm^2	μm^2	
0		208.33	209.94	208.33	[208.3328; 208.3333]	
4.86		201.98	195.98	189	[178; 199]	
5.85	208.33	201.75	190.36	191	[184; 199]	
7.52		201.61	184.92	187	[177; 196]	
10.31		201.55	174.31	171	[153; 189]	

 Table 1. Comparison of fracture permeability estimates from the different modelling assumptions for various JRCs.

approximately 3% to 13.5% for the different roughness values. Moreover, 2D Darcy upscaling based on the mechanical aperture field is unable to capture the roughness effect: we only observe slight variations in the estimation of K_D^{am} in Table 1 and Figure 2, which remains around $K_D^{am} = 201 \,\mu m^2$ for the four fracture geometries. This highlights that the local application of the Cubic Law neither captures nor accounts for the geometrical characteristics of the fracture, which are discarded when the 3D fracture domain Ω^{3D} is projected onto aperture maps.

Overall, when incorporating roughness effects, we demonstrate the following hierarchical relationships in the modelling of fracture permeability: $K_{CL} > K_D^{a_m} > K_{NS}$. We particularly emphasise that mechanical aperture measurements alone are insufficient to explain the overall flow behaviour of a rough fracture by neglecting significant 3D effects. Finally, we show that both the Cubic Law approximation and 2D Darcy flowbased upscaling fail to provide consistent estimates of fracture permeability when based solely on the mechanical aperture field (see Figure 2). Therefore, investigating the derivation of relevant and meaningful hydraulic aperture maps appears crucial to correct model misspecifications in fracture conductivity and to ensure reliable uncertainty quantification in fault-related leakage for CO₂ storage in the subsurface.

3 Automatic AI-driven correction with Uncertainty Quantification

Our objective is to provide an automatic, data-driven correction of the model misspecifications for realistic fracture geometries involving various roughness patterns. We focus on reconstructing the latent hydraulic aperture field $a_h(x, y)$ and its associated uncertainty through a multi-objective, *multi-scale* Bayesian inference approach that integrates data with physicsbased regularisation. In this context, *multi-scale* should be understood differently from the various physical scales (such as roughness scale, subvolume scale of a fracture, or fracture network scale) involved in describing a damaged zone for CO₂ storage applications. When referring to multi-objective Bayesian inference, *multi-scale* denotes a significant difference in the order of magnitude between the various objectives that must be fulfilled simultaneously. This *multi-scale* behaviour is crucial to characterise, as it can significantly impact the convergence of the probabilistic outcomes, as well as the reliable estimation of the uncertainties for each objective. Therefore, our machine learning framework ensures adaptive and automatic weighting of different task uncertainties [20]. In particular, this enables us to robustly balance the contributions from the data and physical constraints when estimating fracture hydraulic conductivity, thereby generating relevant hydraulic aperture and local permeability maps.

3.1 Robust Bayesian Physics-Informed Neural Networks

Exploring the uncertainties related to inferring the latent hydraulic aperture field $a_h(x, y)$ entails solving a multi-objective problem that integrates measurement data with modelling constraints in a probabilistic framework. Deep learning surrogate models, based on Bayesian Physics-Informed Neural Networks (B-PINNs), have shown great promise in addressing inverse problems involving uncertainty quantification and latent field reconstruction [29, 30, 31]. Indeed, B-PINNs have attracted growing interest for accelerating Bayesian inference across a variety of scientific applications [32, 33, 34].

Initially, the Bayesian formulation explores the probabilistic posterior distribution of a set of unknown parameters, $\Theta = \{\theta, \mathcal{P}_{inv}\}$ which includes the Bayesian neural network parameters θ along with potential inverse parameters \mathcal{P}_{inv} of the physical model. The posterior distribution typically involves a likelihood term $P(\mathcal{D}|\Theta)$, evaluating the distance to the data \mathcal{D} , physics-based likelihood constraints $P(\mathcal{M}|\Theta)$, including potential model \mathcal{M} discrepancies or misspecifications, and a joint prior distribution $P(\Theta)$ over the set of parameters. This results in the sampling of a high-dimensional and multi-task posterior distribution over the parameters Θ , expressed as:

$$P(\Theta|\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) \propto P(\mathcal{D}|\Theta)P(\mathcal{M}|\Theta)P(\Theta).$$
 (5)

The distribution of solutions in Bayesian inference, which are close to the optimum and characterise the uncertainties of the problem, is subsequently obtained through a marginalisation process called Bayesian Model Average (BMA) [35]. The latter translates the posterior distribution over the parameters Θ in Eq. (5) into a probability function over the fields of interest.

Specifically, we are interested in quantifying

$$P(a_h|X, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) = \int P(a_h|X, \Theta) P(\Theta|\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) d\Theta \qquad (6)$$

where X is the input of the neural network (*e.g.* spatial coordinates in Ω^{2D}) and a_h is the predictive output of the B-PINNS for the hydraulic aperture field. The relationship Eq. (6) ensures that the various predictions resulting from sampling the parameter distributions through Eq. (5) are averaged, providing a mean prediction along with uncertainties on the hydraulic aperture field.

Although B-PINNs provide a valuable probabilistic framework for data assimilation and surrogate modelling, their training encounters challenges stemming from the multi-scale and multi-objective nature of the Bayesian inference problems. Ensuring robust inference, specifically predictions of field variables and Quantities of Interest (QoI), hinges on properly estimating the various objective uncertainties, which are characterised by unknown weighting parameters. Poorly balanced conditions among the different tasks, resulting from inappropriate weight choices, can lead to biased predictions [36], so-called vanishing-task behaviours — where one or more objectives are neglected in favour of another one - [37, 38], and instabilities [20] that can significantly compromise the B-PINNs training. This can further prevent the sampler from effectively identifying the Pareto front neighbourhood, which represents the highest posterior probability region for which the predictions successfully balance the different tasks (see Pareto front representation in Figure 3). Therefore, the efficient sampling of the high-dimensional posterior distribution Eq. (5) is achieved through the Adaptively Weighted Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (AW-HMC) method, introduced by Perez et al. [20]. This approach relies on adaptive and automatic weighting of the target posterior distribution, leveraging the gradient information of the different tasks to ensure balanced conditions and reliable exploration of the Pareto front. Indeed, the weighting parameters are adjusted during the sampling for a number of adaptive steps, which facilitate convergence toward the high probability-density region. For details on the AW-HMC method, see Appendix C. This enhancement of the traditional formulation helps mitigate the previous training challenges and represents a significant advancement by bringing robustness to the B-PINNs. Overall, the AW-HMC sampler demonstrated notable performance in integrating multiple sources of uncertainty within multi-objective and multi-scale Bayesian inference problems, and therefore, presents a promising opportunity to address model misspecification in fracture conductivity [20, 31].

3.2 A multi-objective inference problem

Synthetic or experimental μ CT images of the fracture geometries are presumed to be available within the domain Ω^{3D} , together with measurements of mechanical aperture maps defined over the two-dimensional projection Ω^{2D} . While this section focuses on the four individual fractures previously introduced, it is important to highlight that when dealing with larger and more realistic fracture networks, the collected dataset of fracture geometries is designed to include a limited selection of extracted subvolumes, as illustrated by the red squares in Figure 3. These subvolumes aim to represent various local patterns of the mechanical aperture and roughness, forming a basis for constructing a comprehensive dataset through the upcoming Bayesian inference. Once the geometrical relationship between the mechanical and hydraulic apertures is inferred from the selection of subvolumes, it can subsequently be used to upscale the uncertainties in fracture network conductivity, eliminating the need for direct numerical simulations over the entire fracture network geometry (as further described in *Discussion*).

In this context, the input dataset \mathcal{D} for the Bayesian-PINNs correction consists of Nobs scattered and noisy measurements of the mechanical apertures at several spatial locations (x_i, y_i) , taken as a subset of Ω^{2D} , such that $\mathcal{D} =$ $\{a_m(x_i, y_i); (x_i, y_i) \in \Omega^{2D}, i = 1...N_{obs}\}$. In comparison to the original resolution of the 2D mechanical aperture maps (256×128) , the training data of the B-PINNs are randomly distributed across Ω^{2D} and account for approximately one-third of the 32 768 available aperture measurements, i.e., $N_{obs} \simeq 10\,000$. Once selected, this training dataset remains unchanged throughout the Bayesian inference process, i.e., during all sampling steps of the posterior distribution Eq. (5). The final predictions of the hydraulic aperture and corrected permeability fields are, however, validated over the entire computational domain Ω^{2D} . The latent hydraulic aperture field is first constrained by the mechanical aperture data in the sense that $a_m(x_i, y_i) = a_h(x_i, y_i) + \xi_d(x_i, y_i)$, where ξ_d refers to the data uncertainties given by a Gaussian distribution $\xi_d \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_d^2 I)$ with an unknown standard deviation σ_d^2 . Given the AW-HMC sampler, this leads to the following expression of the data-fitting likelihood term

$$P(\mathcal{D}|\Theta) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_d^2} \|a_h - a_m\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2\right) \tag{7}$$

which quantifies the discrepancies between the mechanical aperture measurements and the inferred hydraulic apertures (see Appendix C). The data uncertainties ξ_d account for both measurement errors in the mechanical aperture and conceptual difference between the structural width $a_m(x, y)$ and the effective aperture $a_h(x, y)$ that contributes to fluid flow. We also impose the hydraulic aperture to be upper bounded by the mechanical aperture as a hard physical constraint

$$a_h(x_i, y_i) \le a_m(x_i, y_i), \,\forall i \in 1...N_{obs}.$$
(8)

The latter merely comes from the observation that the mechanical aperture map tends to overestimate the fracture conductivity by providing a strict flow barrier (see Figure 1).

Finally, the physics-based constraint intends to correct the local applicability of the Cubic Law given by Eq. (4) by incorporating roughness effects. This approach provides a proxy for the hydraulic aperture field that accurately captures the upscaled flow behaviour, based on Stokes evaluations of the



Figure 3. Workflow overview to correct model misspecification in estimating the conductivity of rough fractures and subsequently of complex fracture networks. Given the full 3D geometry of a fracture network, obtained via μ CT, we perform robust Bayesian inference of the hydraulic aperture, $a_h(x, y)$, and local permeability, $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$, fields over a few extracted representative subvolumes. Guidelines regarding the selection of these representative subvolumes is further described in Discussion. The Bayesian inference is achieved through the AI-driven uncertainty quantification methodology introduced in the current work, which integrates both data-driven and physics-based approaches in a multi-objective inference. Efficient exploration of the Pareto front neighbourhood, which involves sampling the green points while avoiding the unbalanced conditions represented by the red samples, is ensured through a robust B-PINN formulation in the context of multi-objective inference. The data-driven component relies on input measurements of the mechanical aperture field (obtained by projecting the absolute positions of the fracture walls onto a distance map) and the local applicability of the Cubic Law, which fails to capture the effects of roughness. The physics-based correction, therefore, benefits from the input upscaled permeability estimate K_{NS} , obtained by locally solving the Stokes equation on the subvolumes prior to the Bayesian inference, to incorporate the effects of local relative roughness in the inference $a_h(x,y)$ and $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x,y)$. Overall, our method establishes a mapping between unreliable mechanical aperture data and corrected hydraulic aperture, as well as relevant permeability fields, including their associated uncertainties. This mapping can then be integrated with pattern recognition on realistic fracture networks and Darcy upscaling, using the corrected permeability maps $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$, to provide uncertainty bounds for fracture network conductivity on a larger scale, without the need for additional direct numerical simulations. The resolutions of both the fracture network and the extracted subvolume are provided as indicators of the dimensionality of the problem. The appropriate scaling of the subvolumes can be determined, in practice, through prior statistical analysis of the local mechanical aperture distributions or correlation lengths.

effective permeability K_{NS} . The latter serves as the ground truth and is computed for each extracted subvolume prior to the B-PINN training, where it is used as an input (see Figure 3). Notably, local computations of K_{NS} on multiple extracted subvolumes of a fracture network are computationally more efficient compared to solving the Stokes equation across the entire complex 3D fracture network. Therefore, this approach will allow for fast upscaling to realistic fracture network geometries by leveraging several geometrical and probabilistic mappings between a_m and a_h . It can subsequently provide reliable estimates of the conductivity of fracture networks while accounting for smaller-scale uncertainties due to roughness. The physical correction leverages the initial distribution of the mechanical aperture field and automatically accounts for the deviation of the inferred hydraulic aperture field from the mean value $\langle a_m \rangle$ relative to the standard deviation σ_{a_m} of the mechanical aperture field (see histogram in Figure 3). We refer to this modelling adjustment as a local relative roughness correction of the Cubic Law, ensuring the hydraulic aperture field satisfies the constraint:

$$K_{NS} = \frac{1}{|\Omega^{2D}|} \int_{\Omega^{2D}} K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y) \, dx \, dy + \xi_m \tag{9}$$

where $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$ is the local permeability based on a_h and inferred by the B-PINN, and ξ_m stands for the modelling uncertainties such that $\xi_m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_m^2 I)$, with σ_m unknown. Here, the modelling uncertainties ξ_m account for both model misspecification and potential numerical errors in the evaluation of K_{NS} . Eq. (9) thus ensures the arithmetic mean of the local permeability field $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$, derived from the following geometrical correction

$$K_{NN}^{a_h}(x,y) = \frac{a_h(x,y)^2}{12} \left(1 + \alpha \frac{|a_h(x,y) - \langle a_m \rangle|}{\sigma_{a_m}} \right)$$
(10)

fits the upscaled Stokes permeability K_{NS} . This stands as the physics-based likelihood constraint, which is given by

$$P(\mathcal{M}|\Theta) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_m^2} \left\| K_{NS} - \frac{1}{|\Omega^{2D}|} \int_{\Omega^{2D}} K_{NN}^{a_h}(x,y) \, dx dy \right\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2\right)$$
(11)

for which the unknown correction factor α is inferred adaptively and automatically during the sampling process. The relationship in Eq. (10) guarantees that when the hydraulic aperture is locally close to the mean mechanical aperture, we recover a local permeability estimate that closely aligns with the Cubic Law approximation. Conversely, when the hydraulic aperture falls within the tails of the mechanical aperture distribution, causing significant deviations from the mean value $< a_m >$, the relative roughness term becomes predominant and, therefore, leads to an automatic and local correction of the Cubic Law approximation. In practice, the integral formulation used in the physics-based likelihood constraint Eq. (11) is approximated by its discrete arithmetic mean over the N_{obs} observation points during the sampling phase of the B-PINNs. In contrast, during the prediction phase, the validity of the arithmetic upscaling Eq. (10) is evaluated over the entire domain Ω^{2D} , leading to reliable predictions of the hydraulic aperture and local corrected permeability fields on Ω^{2D} .

Overall, we infer a proxy for the relevant latent hydraulic aperture field $a_h(x, y)$, which is constrained by the mechanical aperture dataset, given the data-likelihood from Eq. (7) and the upper bound constraint Eq. (8), and the geometrically dependent correction from Eq. (11). Reliable inference is achieved through the AW-HMC sampler within a robust multi-objective B-PINN framework. The underlying idea is that both the data and modelling constraints involve intrinsic, unknown uncertainties. By efficiently exploring the set of optimal trade-off solutions — *i.e.*, the Pareto front, where no objective can be improved without compromising another, as illustrated in Figure 3 — we can thus capture the full distribution of solutions that accounts for both data and modelling uncertainties in this multi-objective Bayesian inference problem. Furthermore, the automatic weighting in the AW-HMC sampler helps characterising the uncertainties of each specific objective, thereby highlighting the most uncertain tasks within the Bayesian inference problem. A schematic diagram summarising the workflow is presented in Figure 3.

3.3 Results

Bayesian inference of the hydraulic aperture field is performed on the four previously introduced fracture geometries, with increasing wall roughness identified by their respective JRCs. We also validated our methodology on a fracture with no roughness, characterised by two parallel, smooth planes with a constant mean aperture of $\langle a_m \rangle = 50 \, \mu m$. In this theoretical case, the different modelling approaches - Cubic Law, Darcy flow-based upscaling, Stokes, and the B-PINN correction provide similar results, as the mechanical aperture closely matches the hydraulic aperture (see Appendix A for details on the slight deviation in Stokes permeability in Table 1). However, as the JRCs increase, we observe significant deviations between the aperture fields. Figure 4 shows the result of the inference on the hydraulic aperture for the rough fracture #4 with JRC = 10.31, whose 3D geometry is illustrated in Figure 4B. In Figure 4A, we first compare the local maps in Ω^{2D} of the initial mechanical aperture field a_m with the Bayesian Model Average on the inferred hydraulic aperture. The BMA prediction, as defined in Eq. (6), is commonly approximated by:

$$P(a_h|X, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) \simeq \frac{1}{N_s - N} \sum_{i=N}^{N_s} P(a_h|X, \Theta^{t_i}), \quad (12)$$

where $P(a_h|X, \Theta^{t_i})$ represents the surrogate model prediction of the hydraulic aperture, evaluated at the spatial coordinates $X = \{(x, y) \in \Omega^{2D}\}$, and resulting from the sampling iteration i of the set of parameters Θ . In Eq. (12), N_s refers to the total number of sampling steps and N is the number of adaptive steps in the B-PINN process, such that the samples $\{\Theta^{t_i}\}_{i=N}^{N_s}$ are theoretically drawn from the target posterior distribution $\Theta^{t_i} \sim P(\Theta | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M})$ (see Eq. (5)). Likewise, local uncertainties in the hydraulic aperture field are computed using the standard deviation of the posterior distribution on the B-PINN predictions, as illustrated in Figure 4A. These results underscore that regions with the largest mechanical aperture values have minimal impact on the effective permeability and upscaled behaviour of the fracture. Indeed, the observed cut-off in the hydraulic aperture within areas of maximum mechanical aperture suggests that these high-aperture zones do not contribute significantly to fluid flow resistance when the roughness of the fracture wall is substantial. The local uncertainties in the hydraulic aperture field are also primarily localised in these areas, which is consistent with the largest deviations between the two aperture fields. In our case, although the absolute relative error between a_h and a_m appears significant in regions of the largest mechanical aperture, this behaviour is expected, as our approach aims to compensate for errors in both the data and the model by combining data-driven and physics-based methods. Additionally, we have demonstrated that the mechanical aperture field is not a suitable dataset for providing reliable fracture conductivity, as the data-fitting constraint proves to be the most uncertain task in the Bayesian inference problem. As a result, B-PINN with the AW-HMC sampler automatically detects that the modelling uncertainty is smaller than the data uncertainty,



Figure 4. Hydraulic aperture inference on rough fracture with JRC = 10.31. (A) 2D maps comparing the original mechanical aperture field and the BMA (or mean prediction see Eq. (6)) on the hydraulic aperture field, on the top row. Absolute relative error between the original and inferred aperture fields, and local uncertainties on the hydraulic aperture map, on the bottom row. (B) 3D fracture geometry Ω^{3D} highlighting the roughness and fracture dimensions in micrometers. (C) Histograms of the aperture values within the fracture domain: comparison between the initial mechanical aperture distribution (in blue) and the final distribution on the BMA of the inferred hydraulic aperture (in red). The dashed line corresponds to the mean mechanical aperture value $\langle a_m \rangle$, and the two vertical lines delimits the 68% confidence interval given the standard deviation σ_{a_m} . We capture an automatic distribution shift that shortens the contribution of the highest aperture values to the global flow behaviour.

i.e., $\sigma_m \leq \sigma_d$. Specifically, an automatic distribution shift towards the smallest aperture values, which restrict the flow rate and are meaningful to explain the upscaled flow behaviour, is observed in Figure 4C, where we compare the histograms of the mechanical and hydraulic apertures within the fracture domain.

Apart from providing hydraulic aperture fields, our approach allows us to derive permeability maps based on a_h that automatically account for roughness effects through local geometric corrections of the Cubic Law, resulting from the physics-based constraint in Eq. (9). In particular, in Figure 5A we present the BMA prediction and uncertainties for the inferred permeability field $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$, computed as described in Equations (17) and (18) of the Appendix B. The latter are compared with the original permeability map derived from the local Cubic Law approximation (Eq. (4)) for the JRC = 10.31. This shows a significant reduction in permeability in areas of largest mechanical aperture, where the deviations between $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x,y)$ and $K_{CL}^{a_m}(x,y)$ are primarily localised. A distribution shift in the permeability values across the fracture domain is also identified in Figure 5C. We especially compare the initial permeability distribution resulting from $K_{CL}^{a_m}(x, y)$ with the final distribution on $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$ inferred from the Bayesian inference. We also observe that the

Cubic Law approximation K_{CL} , indicated by the vertical red dashed line, remains outside the final permeability distribution for the rough fracture #4, while the effective Stokes upscaling value K_{NS} is accurately captured. This highlights that our strategy can effectively correct for model misspecification in estimating fracture conductivity and accounts for smallerscale uncertainties through a well-balanced combination of data-driven and physics-based constraints. The latter is ensured by the convergence of our AW-HMC sampler towards the Pareto front neighbourhood, as well as the convergence of the upscaled permeability values derived from $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$, as illustrated in Figure 5B. We notice that the adaptive steps of the AW-HMC approach allow the sampler to produce a local permeability field that satisfies the physics-based constraint in Eq. (9) in the sense that its arithmetic mean converges towards the unbiased Stokes estimate K_{NS} rather than the Cubic Law permeability K_{CL} . However, it is important to highlight that the methodology is independent of the choice of the arithmetic mean in Eq. (9) and yields comparable results when using the geometric or harmonic mean.

The upscaled permeability values of the mean predictions for the permeability fields $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y) - i.e.$, the BMA predictions $P(K_{NN}^{a_h}|X, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M})$ as defined in Eq. (17) of the Appendix **B** — are finally compared, in Table 1, with the other



Figure 5. Permeability inference on rough fracture with JRC = 10.31. (A) 2D maps comparing the permeability field $K_{CL}^{a_m}(x, y)$ resulting from the local Cubic Law (Eq. (4)) and the BMA on the local permeability field based on the hydraulic aperture $K_{NN}^{a_m}(x, y)$ (Eq. (10)), on the top row. Absolute relative error and local uncertainties on the inferred permeability map, on the bottom row. (B) Convergence of the upscaled permeability based on $K_{NN}^{a_m}(x, y)$, together with its uncertainty, toward the unbiased Stokes estimate along the sampling steps of the AW-HMC process. The grev vertical dashed line delimits the number of adaptive steps in the AW-HMC sampler to reach the Pareto front neighbourhood. (C) Histograms of the permeability values within the fracture domain: comparison between the initial distribution on $K_{CL}^{a_m}(x, y)$ (in blue) and the final distribution on the BMA of the inferred permeability $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$ (in green). The red and green dashed lines correspond, respectively, to biased Cubic Law estimation of the permeability K_{CL} and the unbiased Stokes permeability K_{NS} .

modelling alternatives across the four different fracture geometries. Additionally, we provide in Table 1 uncertainty ranges for the upscaled permeability values, which are derived from the local uncertainties associated with the permeability field predictions inferred through our Bayesian formulation (see Eq. (18) of the Appendix B). These results demonstrate that our AI-driven correction of the Cubic Law and Darcy model misspecifications can automatically recover meaningful permeability ranges and mean upscaled values, incorporating the effects of roughness in the estimation of fracture conductivity. Overall, we successfully generate local permeability maps, along with associated uncertainty, that are compatible (by construction) with Stokes upscaling for each fracture geometry. Notably, these corrected permeability maps are now suitable and relevant for 2D Darcy flow-based upscaling, which, in turn, yields results compatible with Stokes upscaling (see Table 2 in Appendix B). In other words, our approach also enables the recovery of a local permeability field that can ensure robust estimation of fracture conductivity through Darcy upscaling, now leveraging the latent hydraulic aperture rather than relying on error-prone measurements of the mechanical aperture. This holds considerable interest in providing uncertainty ranges of conductivity at the larger scale, enabling the extension of

our methodology to complex fracture networks such as fault fracture networks.

4 Discussion

In this work, we introduced an AI-driven uncertainty quantification framework designed to address model misspecification in fracture conductivity, and thereby reduce their associated uncertainties. This robust framework represents the first step toward a better understanding of how small-scale uncertainties propagate and impact the overall fracture network conductivities. This will provide more realistic ranges for calibrating network hydraulic conductivity, used in sensitivity analyses at the reservoir-caprock scale to estimate fault permeability, and can ensure reliable assessments of CO₂ fault-related leakage in the context of de-risking CCS facilities. In addition, our approach will find relevance in characterizing fluid flow along fractures in other applications. For the subsurface, these could include geothermal energy, particularly where geothermal fluids are produced from faults or fractured reservoirs. It is also highly applicable to groundwater management, where understanding how contaminants travel through fractured aquifers is critical for pollution control and remediation. Furthermore, this

is relevant for radioactive waste storage in granitic or argillitic formations, where fractures pose a risk for radionuclide leakage.

In particular, we demonstrate that common modelling approximations relying on measurements of the mechanical aperture of fractures, such as the empirical Cubic Law and Darcy flow-based upscaling, fail to capture the effects of roughness and the associated smaller-scale uncertainties. The roughness, however, significantly influences the upscaled flow behaviour of rough fractures, and such modelling misspecifications lead to a non-negligible overestimation of the conductivity. While these effects are quantified using synthetic fracture geometries, this raises concerns regarding the validity of these models for realistic fracture network geometries.

Therefore, we propose a deep learning alternative that learns the mapping between the unreliable mechanical and the latent hydraulic aperture maps, which is relevant to explain the upscaled flow behaviour of a fracture at the small scale. This is achieved through a multi-objective Bayesian inference, coupling data-driven constraints with a physics-based regularisation that aims to correct the local Cubic Law by accounting for the roughness. Both the modelling and data uncertainties are adaptively and automatically characterised by the AW-HMC sampler in the B-PINN framework, allowing for a robust inference and efficient exploration of the optimal Pareto front neighbourhood.

Our approach generates hydraulic aperture distributions that reveal a reduced influence of the largest mechanical aperture areas on fluid flow in rough fractures. We further derive local permeability maps based on the inferred hydraulic apertures, ensuring their upscaling effectively captures the unbiased Stokes estimate of permeability. Additionally, these corrected and probabilistic permeability maps are now Darcy-consistent and can serve as inputs for Darcy flow-based upscaling, providing compatible uncertainty ranges for conductivity across various roughness levels and scales.

Therefore, this work presents a significant step in developing a multi-scale AI workflow that leverages pattern recognition of local mechanical aperture maps within a complex fracture network to associate the corresponding permeability maps and their uncertainties, as inferred from our Bayesian inference approach. The objective is to conduct Bayesian inference, as introduced in this work, on selected extracted subvolumes of the fracture network. These subvolumes should be representative of different roughness patterns and aperture distributions within the overall fracture network; therefore, their appropriate resolutions can be determined through prior statistical analysis of local mechanical aperture histograms or correlation lengths. Such a dataset consisting of paired images of mechanical apertures $a_m(x, y)$ and probabilistic functions of the permeability field $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$, evaluated on the extracted subvolumes, can subsequently be input into purely data-driven machine learning models. This will lead to improved generalisation to previously unseen fracture network geometries, while simultaneously enhancing the propagation of uncertainties across different scales. This approach will then yield a complete corrected permeability map for the entire 3D fracture network that locally accounts for the geometric characteristics of individual fractures at the small scale, and can finally be coupled with Darcy flow-based upscaling at the larger scale. Similar techniques, relying on Convolutional Neural Networks, have successfully been employed to estimate the upscaled permeability of rock cores from μ CT images [39], as well as other properties of porous media such as porosity or specific surface area [40]. The primary advantage is the low computational cost associated with Bayesian inference, which can be executed in parallel across various subvolumes. Furthermore, this will enhance the generalisation of the AI workflow to different fracture network geometries, rendering it an attractive alternative to DNS methods. Upscaling the uncertainties in fracture network conductivity is also of crucial importance when it comes to ensuring reliable estimates of the CO₂ fault-leakage rates. Overall, such a deep learning based upscaling will allow estimating the conductivity of a complex fracture network, with large field of view, while preserving the effects of small-scales uncertainties in terms of the local heterogeneities, geometric variations and roughness.

Finally, our method paves the way for investigating the propagation of uncertainties across different scales regarding the effects of CO_2 trapping in multi-phase flow. Roughness and aperture variations play a significant role in trapping and fluid phase distributions in geological fractures [41, 25, 42, 43, 44]. Similarly, leveraging a reliable mapping between mechanical aperture and locally corrected permeability fields is essential for understanding how small-scale uncertainties influence hydro-mechanical coupled processes, including their effect on deformations resulting from changes in mechanical stress [45]. Investigating the uncertainties associated with these processes remains critical in the context of fault-related leakage for CO_2 storage in the subsurface.

A Stokes Permeability

The effective absolute permeability K_{NS} estimated on the realistic fracture domain Ω^{3D} and used in our workflow (see Figure 3 in the main text) is obtained as follows. We rely on a binary decomposition of the domain such that the 3D fracture geometry is split into a solid and fluid - or void - domain, respectively denoted Ω_s^{3D} and Ω_f^{3D} . The fracture interface is denoted Σ . In this context, we assume fully impermeable fracture walls and neglect the potential contribution of sub-resolved micro-porosity of the surrounding matrix. This stands as an additional modelling assumption, which is rather conventional when addressing reservoir-scale simulations of fault-related leakage, essentially due to the very distinct time response in fluid migration of the porous matrix compared to the main fracture network. However, the impact of the surrounding porous matrix in the overall conductivity of the fault zone or in the stress management of the individual fractures can be investigated in future works. We also estimate the fracture permeability in the main flow-path direction, taken in this study along the x-axis (see Figure 4B in the main text).



Figure 6. Evolution of permeability estimates over the iterations of the Stokes solver for the different fracture geometries, with roughness characterised by the JRCs. The dashed horizontal line represents the overestimated fracture permeability resulting from the direct Cubic Law approximation. Deviations in fracture permeability due to roughness are identified, ranging from approximately 6% to 16%. These estimations of the Stokes permeabilities for the different JRCs are performed prior to the Bayesian inference.

Given the micrometric scale of the flow within the fracture domains, we assume flow regimes driven by low Reynolds numbers such that Navier-Stokes simplifies to the quasi-stationary Stokes equation. Flow-based Direct Numerical Simulations (DNS) are obtained by solving the incompressible Stokes equation in Ω^{3D} with homogeneous Dirichlet or adherent boundary conditions on the fracture walls:

$$\begin{cases}
-\mu\Delta u + \nabla p = f & \text{in } \Omega_f^{3D} \\
\nabla \cdot u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_f^{3D} \\
u = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\
u \text{ and } p \text{ periodic} & \text{on } \partial\Omega^{3D}
\end{cases}$$
(13)

where u is the pore-scale velocity, p the pressure, μ the dynamic viscosity and f the driving force. We impose periodic boundary conditions on $\partial \Omega^{3D}$ by considering a thin fluid layer on the inlet and outlet, in the flow direction. The fracture per-

meability is subsequently obtained from upscaling at the Darcy scale and evaluated in the main flow-path direction, so that we end up with a scalar absolute permeability defined by:

$$K_{NS} = \frac{\phi \mu < u_x >_{\Omega_f^{3D}}}{< f_x >_{\Omega_\ell^{3D}}} \tag{14}$$

where u_x and f_x are the horizontal components of the velocity and driving force, respectively. The notation $\langle . \rangle_{\Omega_f^{3D}}$ represents the average in the fluid domain, ϕ the fracture macroporosity and $v = \phi \langle u \rangle_{\Omega_f^{3D}}$ is the so-called superficial or Darcy velocity [46]. In the present context, the macro-porosity is set to $\phi = 1$ to account solely for the fracture permeability rather than the overall permeability of the sample, which can be considered as a porous medium with a large fracture. This follows the assumption that the fracture dominates the flow behaviour, with no contribution from the porous matrix in



Figure 7. Comparison of Stokes permeability estimates for different fracture geometries, with roughness characterized by the JRCs and varying mean apertures ranging from $30\mu m$ to $60\mu m$, shown on the left. For a given JRC, the fracture geometries remain identical, while the mean aperture is either increased or reduced compared to the reference case with $\langle a_m \rangle = 50\mu m$. The dashed horizontal lines represent the overestimated fracture permeability resulting from direct Cubic Law approximations for each mean mechanical aperture value $\langle a_m \rangle$. Relative deviations in permeability with respect to the Cubic Law, computed as $(K_{CL} - K_{NS})/K_{CL}$, for different JRCs and varying mean apertures, are shown on the right. This highlights greater deviations for smaller aperture values, reaching nearly 40%, and emphasizes the importance of considering corrections for such model misspecifications.

estimating the upscaled permeability.

Numerical modelling of flow within the fracture domain Ω^{3D} is finally achieved through the DNS Stokes solver developed and validated on realistic 3D porous sample geometries in Perez et al. [27]. This consists of an iterative solver based on a residual criterion for convergence, such that the number of Stokes iterations is independent of the number of sampling steps N_s in the Bayesian inference. The 3D computational domain closely aligns with the fracture geometries and consists of a grid with a resolution of $256 \times 128 \times 30$, scaled such that $\delta x = 3.94 \,\mu m$. The convergence of the permeability values K_{NS} for the four synthetic fracture geometries obtained from the Digital Rock Physics portal [21] (see Section Fracture dataset with varying roughnesses in the main text) are presented and compared in the following Figure 6. These results show non-negligible deviations on the fracture permeability due to increased roughness of the fracture walls, characterised by their Joint Roughness Coefficients (JRCs). The relative deviations, computed as $(K_{CL} - K_{NS})/K_{CL}$ with K_{CL} the Cubic Law approximation of the fracture permeability, indeed range from 6% to 16% for the different JRC coefficients. The final effective permeability values K_{NS} obtained for each fracture are summarised in Table 1. One can observe in Table 1 a slight deviation in the Stokes permeability compared to the Cubic Law approximation for the case with no roughness: a relative deviation of less than 1% is noted for the JRC = 0. In this case, the deviation results from the inherent limitations in synthesising and meshing a fracture geometry with an exact constant mechanical aperture of $50\mu m$, and we estimate the

mechanical aperture to be approximately $50.19 \mu m$ for the reconstructed 3D fracture. Indeed, defining a mean aperture and constructing the corresponding 3D geometry (for JRC = 0) is more likely to introduce numerical errors, in contrast to directly projecting the 3D geometries to generate the associated mechanical aperture maps (for the other JRCs). We finally investigate the effect of mean mechanical aperture values on permeability deviations from the Cubic Law by successively increasing and decreasing the mean apertures of the four fractures while keeping their geometries identical to the reference case with $\langle a_m \rangle = 50 \mu m$. The results are compared in Figure 7, and show enhanced deviations for the smallest aperture values, reaching up to 25% for JRC = 4.86 and nearly 40% for JRC = 10.31. This confirms the non-negligible impact of fracture roughness and mean mechanical aperture on the estimation of fracture conductivity.

B 2D Darcy flow-based upscaling

Darcy flow-based upscaling of the fracture permeability, providing estimates on K_D^{am} based on the mechanical aperture map, is performed using the MATLAB Reservoir Simulation Toolbox (MRST) for single-phase flow [28]. The initial permeability distribution is first obtained by applying the local Cubic Law approximation, which results in a permeability map given by $K_{CL}^{am}(x, y)$ (see Eq. (4) and Figure 5A in the main text). The grid resolution of 256×128 is strictly identical to the one used for extracting the training dataset \mathcal{D} for the B-PINN predictions (see Section *A multi-objective inference problem* in the main text). The Darcy flow solver approximates the solution of the following single-phase pressure equation by using the two-point finite volume method in MRST:

$$-\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{K_{CL}^{a_m}(x,y)}{\mu}\nabla p\right) = 0 \tag{15}$$

where $v = -K_{CL}^{a_m}(x, y)\mu^{-1}\nabla p$ is the Darcy velocity, μ the dynamic viscosity and p the pressure. Fixed pressure boundary conditions are applied at the inlet and outlet to generate a pressure gradient that drives the fluid, mimicking the driving force effects in the Stokes solver. We ensure that the pressure drop and driving force settings are compatible for the respective upscaling of fracture permeability in the Darcy and Stokes models. No-flow boundary conditions are applied on the remaining boundaries for the Darcy flow-based upscaling. By solving the Poisson problem Eq. (15), we obtain pressures values for each cell of the grid and fluxes across each faces of the grid, which are used to estimate the fracture permeability. Indeed, the upscaled permeability can be computed over the whole fracture as:

$$K_D^{a_m} = \frac{\mu q L_x}{\Delta p}, \quad \text{with } q = \frac{Q}{A}$$
 (16)

where q is the average velocity across the outflow boundary, computed as the ratio of the flow rate Q (in $m^3.s^{-1}$) by the cross sectional area A (in m^2), and Δp is the average pressure drop over the domain distance L_x . The Darcy permeability values $K_D^{a_m}$ are compared to the global Cubic Law estimate K_{CL} and effective Stokes permeability K_{NS} in Table 1. The latter show discrepancies between $K_D^{a_m}$ and K_{NS} for the different JRCs, confirming that Darcy upscaling based on the mechanical aperture measurements is not sufficient to capture intrinsic roughness effects.

Once the Bayesian inference correcting these model misspecifications is performed, we obtain predictions on the hydraulic aperture $a_h(x, y)$ and corrected permeability $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$ fields for all the sampling steps $i = N...N_s$ of the set of parameters Θ , *i.e.* for $\{\Theta^{t_i}\}_{i=N}^{N_s}$. We can, therefore, characterise the Bayesian Model Average (BMA) on the permeability field $K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$ (see Figure 5 in the main text), which is computed as follows:

$$P(K_{NN}^{a_{h}}|X, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) \simeq \frac{1}{N_{s} - N} \sum_{i=N}^{N_{s}} P(K_{NN}^{a_{h}}|X, \Theta^{t_{i}})$$

$$= \frac{1}{N_{s} - N} \sum_{i=N}^{N_{s}} \frac{P(a_{h}|X, \Theta^{t_{i}})^{2}}{12} \left(1 + \alpha_{\Theta^{t_{i}}} \frac{|P(a_{h}|X, \Theta^{t_{i}}) - \langle a_{m} \rangle|}{\sigma_{a_{m}}}\right)$$
(17)

where $P(a_h|X, \Theta^{t_i})$ and $\alpha_{\Theta^{t_i}}$ represent, respectively, the surrogate model's prediction of the hydraulic aperture field and the evaluation of the correction factor at sampling step i in the B-PINN process (see Figure 8 for the characterisation of the correction factor trajectory throughout the sampling process). This BMA approximation Eq. (17), denoted here for simplicity as $P(K_{NN}^{a_h}|X, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) := \overline{K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)}$, is used as input for 2D Darcy flow-based upscaling. By solving the Poisson equation as in Eq. (15) with the same boundary conditions, where the permeability tensor is now given by $\mathbf{K} = K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)$, we can recover the upscaled corrected permeability, denoted $K_D^{a_h}$. The latter is closer to the effective Stokes permeability K_{NS} and the upscaled value based on the BMA approximation Eq. (17), rather than to the original Darcy upscaling based on the mechanical aperture, $K_D^{a_m}$ (see Table 2). The hierarchical relationships in the modelling of fracture permeability can therefore be expressed as $K_{CL} > K_D^{a_m} > K_{NS} \simeq K_{NN}^{a_h} \simeq K_D^{a_h}$. Finally, uncertainty ranges for $K_D^{a_h}$ are provided, based on the variance of the posterior distribution of the corrected permeability:

$$\operatorname{Var}(K_{NN}^{a_{h}}|X,\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}) \simeq \frac{1}{N_{s}-N} \sum_{i=N}^{N_{s}} \left(P(K_{NN}^{a_{h}}|X,\Theta^{t_{i}}) - \overline{K_{NN}^{a_{h}}(x,y)} \right)^{2},$$
(18)

which is denoted as

$$\operatorname{Var}(K_{NN}^{a_h}|X, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) := \operatorname{Var}\left(K_{NN}^{a_h}(x, y)\right).$$

Darcy flow-based upscaling is performed using the two permeability tensors $\mathbf{K} = \overline{K_{NN}^{a_h}(x,y)} \pm \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}(K_{NN}^{a_h}(x,y))}$, leading to uncertainty ranges in the upscaled permeability. Table 2 compares these uncertainty ranges with those directly estimated from the B-PINN inference and shows good agreement between the two approaches for the various JRCs. Indeed, models incorporating corrected local permeability maps, as derived from hydraulic apertures, consistently yield estimates that align more closely with Stokes effective permeability, particularly in rougher fracture profiles. This suggests that including detailed local corrections to the permeability fields enhances the robustness of upscaling approaches across different fracture geometries and roughness patterns and is therefore highly relevant for larger-scale upscaling, particularly in complex fracture networks.

Table 2. Comparison of fracture permeability estimates from different modelling assumptions for various roughness patterns - Continuation. This table complements Table 1 and confirms that, when applied to the local corrected permeability maps derived from the hydraulic apertures, 2D Darcy flow-based upscaling provides permeability estimates which are consistent with both Stokes and B-PINN inference.

Roughness	Original Darcy	(Navier) Stokes	Bayesiar	n PINN	Corrected Darcy	
JCR	$K_D^{a_m}$	K_{NS}	Mean on $K_{NN}^{a_h}$	UQ on $K_{NN}^{a_h}$	Mean on $K_D^{a_h}$	UQ on $K_D^{a_h}$
/	μm^2	μm^2	μm^2	μm^2	μm^2	μm^2
4.86	201.98	195.98	189	[178; 199]	184	[174; 193]
5.85	201.75	190.36	191	[184; 199]	186	[179; 192]
7.52	201.61	184.92	187	[177; 196]	182	[174; 190]
10.31	201.55	174.31	171	[153; 189]	168	[151; 184]

C AW-HMC for robust B-PINNs

The Bayesian formulation of a multi-objective inference problem, coupling data with physics-based regularisation, aims to explore the following posterior distribution:

$$P(\Theta|\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) \propto P(\mathcal{D}|\Theta)P(\mathcal{M}|\Theta)P(\Theta)$$
(19)

where $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ represents the set of unknown parameters. Efficient sampling of the posterior distribution in high-dimensional spaces — as encountered in Bayesian Physics-Informed Neural Networks — is commonly achieved through a specific Markov Chain Monte Carlo method known as the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) [47]. The HMC sampler introduces an auxiliary variable $r \in \mathbb{R}^p$, which is regarded as the momentum of a fictive particle of position Θ . The objective is, therefore, to explore the manifold corresponding to a joint posterior distribution $\pi(\Theta, r)$ in the phase space, such that the marginal distribution with respect to Θ provides direct samples of the target posterior distribution Eq. (19), *i.e.*

$$P(\Theta|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M}) := \pi(\Theta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \pi(\Theta, r) \, dr.$$
 (20)

The latter is guaranteed via the selection of a conditional probability distribution for the momentum, such that $\pi(\Theta, r) = \pi(r|\Theta)\pi(\Theta)$, and a specific form of the joint distribution, which is given by:

$$\pi(\Theta, r) \sim e^{-H(\Theta, r)}.$$
 (21)

The latter introduces the energy $H(\Theta, r)$ of a conservative Hamiltonian system, which writes as the sum of a potential energy $U(\Theta)$ and a kinetic energy K(r), expressed as

$$H(\Theta, r) = U(\Theta) + K(r)$$

= $-\log \pi(\Theta) - \log \pi(r|\Theta)$
= $-\log P(\Theta|\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M}) - \log \mathcal{N}(r|0, \mathbf{M}).$

The momentum variable commonly follows a centred multivariate Gaussian distribution, $\pi(r|\Theta) \sim \mathcal{N}(r|0, \mathbf{M})$, with a covariance matrix \mathbf{M} often scaled identity. This guarantees that trajectories exploring $\pi(\Theta, r)$ in the phase space will project to trajectories exploring the target distribution, as given by Eq. (20). Besides, the kinetic energy accounts for momentum perturbations by diffusing across several energy levels, and ensures an efficient exploration of the joint posterior distribution in the phase space. The samples (Θ, r) are, therefore, obtained by alternating between stochastic perturbations of the energy levels, driven by the momentum, and deterministic exploration along specific energy level sets. This deterministic exploration is governed by solving the conservative Hamiltonian system:

$$\begin{cases} d\Theta = \mathbf{M}^{-1} r dt \\ dr = -\nabla U(\Theta) dt, \end{cases}$$
(22)

which describes the trajectory of the frictionless, fictive particle with successive positions Θ . A symplectic integrator, such as the leapfrog method, is commonly employed to numerically solve for the dynamical system Eq. (22) (see [47] for a general overview on the HMC sampler). However, discretisation errors in the numerical integration of Eq. (22) can disrupt the Hamiltonian conservation during the deterministic steps. Therefore, a Metropolis-Hasting acceptance criterion is incorporated to ensure the energy conservation. The latter relies on the transition probability of the Hamiltonian and rejects the samples that lead to divergent trajectories.

Finally, the multi-objective nature of the posterior distribution Eq. (19) directly translates into a weighted multi-potential energy

$$U(\Theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \lambda_k U_k(\Theta), \qquad (23)$$

where, for instance, the data-fitting likelihood follows the distribution $P(\mathcal{D}|\Theta) \propto e^{-\lambda_1 U_1(\Theta)}$ with the weighting parameter λ_1 characterising the uncertainties on the data, arising from observation noise. Similarly, each component of the multi-objective posterior distribution can be expressed in relation to the components of the weighted multi-potential energy $U(\Theta)$, with the positive parameters λ_k representing the various sources of uncertainties. In this context, the AW-HMC sampler aims to automatically manage the different task uncertainties through an adaptive weighting of the target posterior distribution based on a control of the weights λ_k [20]. The gradient variances of the different tasks are leveraged for a number of adaptive steps

A) JRC = 4.86



Figure 8. Inference of the inverse parameter α , which serves as the correction factor in the physics-based constraint for the rough fractures #1 and #4 with respectively JRC = 4.86 and 10.31. Phase diagram of the inverse parameter trajectory during sampling, with the adaptive steps trajectory (in red) and the effective sampling (in blue), on the left. Histogram of the marginal posterior distributions of the parameters α , illustrating the distribution tail (in red) due to convergence during the adaptation and the final posterior distribution (in blue), on the right. The posterior mean estimates $\bar{\alpha}$ are derived from the samples collected after the adaptation process. We obtain a log-normal posterior distribution, ensuring the positivity of the inverse parameters α .

 $\tau \leq N$ to ensure the gradient distributions of each potential

energy term $U_k(\Theta)$ have balanced contributions:

$$\lambda_k = \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{\operatorname{Var}\{\nabla_{\Theta} U_k\}}\right)^{1/2},\tag{24}$$

with

$$\gamma^2 := \min_{t=1..K} (\operatorname{Var}\{\nabla_{\Theta} U_t\}), \quad \forall k = 1, ..., K.$$

The AW-HMC sampler, therefore, avoids the vanishing of taskspecific gradients [38] and allows the sampling to focus on the neighbourhood of the Pareto front after the adaptive steps. This ensures unbiased predictions and improves the convergence and stability of the sampler compared to commonly used alternatives, including traditional HMC and No-U-Turn (NUTS) samplers (see [20] for a full comparison). The last weight λ_{K+1} , associated with the prior term $P(\Theta)$, is not adjusted in the same manner as outlined in Eq. (24), because it serves as a regularisation term similar to that used in multi-objective optimisation. In particular, the joint prior distribution on the set of parameters Θ follows a multivariate Gaussian distribution, assuming independent variables, such that $P(\Theta) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_p)$. However, to ensure the positivity of the inverse parameter, specifically the correction factor α , we typically assume a lognormal prior distribution for α and apply the following change of variable: $\alpha = e^{\tilde{\alpha}}$. This appropriate change of variable allows us to consider Gaussian prior distribution on the newly defined set of parameters $\Theta = \{\theta, \tilde{\alpha}\}$, with θ the Bayesian neural network parameters.

Overall, the AW-HMC method can be summarised in Algorithm 1, where Θ^{t_0} refers to the initial state of the set of parameters, N_s is the total number of samples collected during the training and N the effective number of adaptive steps. The adequate number of adaptive steps is determined via a stopping criterion involving the local variations of the Hamiltonian. For details on the use of the stopping criterion, we refer to the original paper on the AW-HMC method [20]. L and δ represent the number of iterations and the step size used in the leapfrog method to solve the Hamiltonian system Eq. (22), respectively. Finally, the collected samples after adaptation $\{\Theta^{t_i}\}_{i=N}^{N_s}$ are theoretically drawn from the target posterior distribution Eq. (19) and are used to provide Bayesian Model Average of the quantities of interest, namely the hydraulic aperture and corrected permeability fields (see Figure 4 and 5 in the main text). Moreover, we obtain a posterior distribution for the unknown correction factor α , which is inferred adaptively and automatically during the sampling process. Both the phase space trajectories of the parameter α and the histogram of its marginal posterior distribution are presented in Figure 8 for the rough fractures #1 and #4, with respectively JRC = 4.86 and 10.31. This figure shows in both cases the convergence of the parameter towards its mode during the adaptive steps $\tau < N$, as indicated in red. Once the adaptive process ends, we begin sampling the posterior distribution of α , as shown in blue. The posterior means of this inverse parameter can also be estimated as $\bar{\alpha} = 3.4e - 2$ and 3.8e - 2 for their respective JRCs.

Acknowledgements

This work is funded by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council's ECO-AI Project grant (reference number **Algorithm 1:** Adaptively Weighted Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (AW-HMC)

Sampling procedure: for $\tau = 1...N_{\circ}$ do Stochastic steps - Momentum sampling: Sample $r^{t_{\tau-1}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{M});$ Set $(\Theta_0, r_0) \leftarrow (\Theta^{t_{\tau-1}}, r^{t_{\tau-1}});$ Weights adaptation: if $(\tau < N)$ then Compute $\lambda_k(\tau) = \left(\frac{\min_{j=1..K} (\operatorname{Var}\{\nabla_{\Theta} U_j(\Theta_0)\})}{\operatorname{Var}\{\nabla_{\Theta} U_k(\Theta_0)\}}\right)^{1/2}$ $\forall k = 1..K \text{ and } \lambda_{K+1}(\tau) = 1;$ else $\begin{array}{ll} \lambda_k(\tau) = \lambda_k(\tau-1) & \forall k=1..K \text{ and} \\ \lambda_{K+1}(\tau) = 1 \end{array}$ Deterministic steps - Leapfrog iterations: for i = 0...L - 1 do $r_{i} \leftarrow r_{i} - \frac{\delta t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \lambda_{k}(\tau) \nabla_{\Theta} U_{k}(\Theta_{i});$ $\Theta_{i+1} \leftarrow \Theta_{i} + \delta t \mathbf{M}^{-1} r_{i};$ $r_{i+1} \leftarrow r_i - \frac{\delta t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \lambda_k(\tau) \nabla_{\Theta} U_k(\Theta_{i+1});$ end Acceptance criterion - Metropolis-Hastings: Sample $p \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$; Compute $\alpha = \min(1, \exp(H(\Theta_0, r_0) - H(\Theta_L, r_L)))$ if $p \leq \alpha$ then $\Theta^{t_{\tau}} = \Theta_L;$ else $\Theta^{t_{\tau}} = \Theta_0$ end Collect the samples after adaptation : $\{\Theta^{t_i}\}_{i=N}^{N_s}$ end

EP/Y006143/1), with additional financial support from the PETRONAS Center of Excellence in Subsurface Engineering and Energy Transition (PACESET).

References

- S. Bachu, "Review of CO2 storage efficiency in deep saline aquifers," *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, vol. 40, pp. 188-202, 2015.
- [2] M. Zoback and D. Smit, "Meeting the challenges of large-scale carbon storage and hydrogen production," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 120, no. 11, p. e2202397120, 2023.
- [3] R. E. Rizzo, N. F. Inskip, H. Fazeli, P. Betlem, K. Bisdom, et al., "Modelling geological CO2 leakage: Integrating fracture permeability and fault zone outcrop analysis," *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, vol. 133, p. 104105, 2024.

- [4] K. Bisdom and A. W. Chan, "De-risking fault leakage risk and containment integrity for subsurface storage applications," *iScience*, vol. 27, no. 6, p. 109957, 2024.
- [5] P. Davy, R. L. Goc, C. Darcel, B. Pinier, J.-O. Selroos, et al., "Structural and hydrodynamic controls on fluid travel time distributions across fracture networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 121, no. 47, p. e2414901121, 2024.
- [6] J. A. White, L. Chiaramonte, S. Ezzedine, W. Foxall, Y. Hao, et al., "Geomechanical behavior of the reservoir and caprock system at the In Salah CO2 storage project," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 111, no. 24, pp. 8747–8752, 2014.
- [7] A. Kubeyev, N. Forbes Inskip, T. Phillips, Y. Zhang, C. Maier, et al., "Digital Image-Based Stress–Permeability Relationships of Rough Fractures Using Numerical Contact Mechanics and Stokes Equation," *Transport in Porous Media*, vol. 141, no. 2, pp. 295–330, 2022.
- [8] H. S. Viswanathan, J. Ajo-Franklin, J. T. Birkholzer, J. W. Carey, Y. Guglielmi, et al., "From Fluid Flow to Coupled Processes in Fractured Rock: Recent Advances and New Frontiers," *Reviews* of *Geophysics*, vol. 60, no. 1, p. e2021RG000744, 2022.
- [9] J. Fang, B. Gong, and J. Caers, "Data-Driven Model Falsification and Uncertainty Quantification for Fractured Reservoirs," *Engineering*, vol. 18, pp. 116–128, 2022.
- [10] A. Dashti, T. Stadelmann, and T. Kohl, "Machine learning for robust structural uncertainty quantification in fractured reservoirs," *Geothermics*, vol. 120, p. 103012, 2024.
- [11] X. Ma, J. Zhao, D. Zhou, K. Zhang, and Y. Tian, "Deep Graph Learning-Based Surrogate Model for Inverse Modeling of Fractured Reservoirs," *Mathematics*, vol. 12, no. 5, 2024.
- [12] L. Gong, B. Liu, X. Fu, H. Jabbari, S. Gao, et al., "Quantitative prediction of sub-seismic faults and their impact on waterflood performance: Bozhong 34 oilfield case study," *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, vol. 172, pp. 60–69, 2019.
- [13] R. S. Jayne, H. Wu, and R. M. Pollyea, "Geologic CO2 sequestration and permeability uncertainty in a highly heterogeneous reservoir," *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, vol. 83, pp. 128–139, 2019.
- [14] Z. Sun, R. Salazar-Tio, L. Wu, B. Bostrøm, A. Fager, et al., "Geomechanical assessment of a large-scale CO2 storage and insights from uncertainty analysis," *Geoenergy Science and Engineering*, vol. 224, p. 211596, 2023.
- [15] T. Phillips, T. Bultreys, K. Bisdom, N. Kampman, S. Van Offenwert, et al., "A Systematic Investigation Into the Control of Roughness on the Flow Properties of 3D-Printed Fractures," *Water Resources Research*, vol. 57, no. 4, p. ewrcr.25233, 2021.
- [16] X. He, W. Zhu, R. Santoso, M. Alsinan, H. Kwak, et al., "Fracture Permeability Estimation Under Complex Physics: A Data-Driven Model Using Machine Learning," *in SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Dubai, UAE*, p. D011S006R001, 2021.
- [17] V. Rasouli and A. Hosseinian, "Correlations Developed for Estimation of Hydraulic Parameters of Rough Fractures Through the Simulation of JRC Flow Channels," *Rock Mechanics and*

Rock Engineering, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 447-461, 2011.

- [18] L. Z. Xie, C. Gao, L. Ren, and C. B. Li, "Numerical investigation of geometrical and hydraulic properties in a single rock fracture during shear displacement with the Navier–Stokes equations," *Environmental Earth Sciences*, vol. 73, no. 11, pp. 7061–7074, 2015.
- [19] X. He, M. Sinan, H. Kwak, and H. Hoteit, "A corrected cubic law for single-phase laminar flow through rough-walled fractures," *Advances in Water Resources*, vol. 154, p. 103984, 2021.
- [20] S. Perez, S. Maddu, I. F. Sbalzarini, and P. Poncet, "Adaptive weighting of bayesian physics informed neural networks for multitask and multiscale forward and inverse problems," *Journal* of Computational Physics, vol. 491, p. 112342, 2023.
- [21] E. Guiltinan, J. E. Santos, Q. Kang, B. Cardenas, and D. N. Espinoza, "Fractures with variable roughness and wettability." https://www.digitalrocksportal.org/projects/314, 2020.
- [22] S. R. Ogilvie, E. Isakov, and P. W. Glover, "Fluid flow through rough fractures in rocks. II: A new matching model for rough rock fractures," *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, vol. 241, no. 3, pp. 454–465, 2006.
- [23] Y. Li and Y. Zhang, International "Quantitative estimation of joint roughness coefficient using statistical parameters," *Journal* of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences, vol. 77, pp. 27–35, 2015.
- [24] N. Myers, "Characterization of surface roughness," Wear,vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 182–189, 1962.
- [25] E. J. Guiltinan, J. E. Santos, M. B. Cardenas, D. N. Espinoza, and Q. Kang, "Two-Phase Fluid Flow Properties of Rough Fractures With Heterogeneous Wettability: Analysis With Lattice Boltzmann Simulations," *Water Resources Research*, vol. 57, no. 1, p. e2020WR027943, 2021.
- [26] J. Banhart, Advanced Tomographic Methods in Materials Research and Engineering. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [27] S. Perez, P. Moonen, and P. Poncet, "On the Deviation of Computed Permeability Induced by Unresolved Morphological Features of the Pore Space," *Transport in Porous Media*, vol. 141, no. 1, pp. 151–184, 2022.
- [28] K.-A. Lie, An Introduction to Reservoir Simulation Using MAT-LAB/GNU Octave: User Guide for the MATLAB Reservoir Simulation Toolbox (MRST). Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [29] L. Yang, X. Meng, and G. E. Karniadakis, "B-PINNs: Bayesian physics-informed neural networks for forward and inverse PDE problems with noisy data," *Journal of Computational Physics*, vol. 425, p. 109913, 2021.
- [30] K. Linka, A. Schäfer, X. Meng, Z. Zou, G. E. Karniadakis, et al., "Bayesian Physics Informed Neural Networks for real-world nonlinear dynamical systems," *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, vol. 402, p. 115346, 2022.
- [31] S. Perez and P. Poncet, "Auto-weighted Bayesian Physics- Informed Neural Networks and robust estimations for multitask inverse problems in pore-scale imaging of dissolution," *Computational Geosciences*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 1175–1215, 2024.
- [32] J. P. Molnar and S. J. Grauer, "Flow field tomography with

uncertainty quantification using a Bayesian physics-informed neural network," *Measurement Science and Technology*, vol. 33, no. 6, p. 065305, 2022.

- [33] R. Gou, Y. Zhang, X. Zhu, and J. Gao, "Bayesian Physics- Informed Neural Networks for the Subsurface Tomography Based on the Eikonal Equation," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 61, pp. 1–12, 2023.
- [34] P. Li, D. Grana, and M. Liu, "Bayesian neural network and Bayesian physics-informed neural network via variational inference for seismic petrophysical inversion," *Geophysics*, vol. 89, no. 6, pp. M185–M196, 2024.
- [35] A. G. Wilson and P. Izmailov, "Bayesian Deep Learning and a Probabilistic Perspective of Generalization," *in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 4697–4708, Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [36] N. Rahaman, A. Baratin, D. Arpit, F. Draxler, M. Lin, et al., "On the Spectral Bias of Neural Networks," *in Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5301–5310, PMLR, 2019.
- [37] O. Sener and V. Koltun, "Multi-Task Learning as Multi-Objective Optimization," in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 31, Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [38] S. Maddu, D. Sturm, C. L. Müller, and I. F. Sbalzarini, "Inverse Dirichlet weighting enables reliable training of physics informed neural networks," *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 015026, 2022.
- [39] F. Jiang, Y. Guo, T. Tsuji, Y. Kato, M. Shimokawara, et al., "Upscaling Permeability Using Multiscale X-Ray-CT Images With Digital Rock Modeling and Deep Learning Techniques," *Water Resources Research*, vol. 59, no. 3, p. e2022WR033267, 2023.
- [40] N. Alqahtani, F. Alzubaidi, R. T. Armstrong, P. Swietojanski, and P. Mostaghimi, "Machine learning for predicting properties of porous media from 2d X-ray images," *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, vol. 184, p. 106514, 2020.
- [41] Z. Yang, I. Neuweiler, Y. Méheust, F. Fagerlund, and A. Niemi, "Fluid trapping during capillary displacement in fractures," *Advances in Water Resources*, vol. 95, pp. 264–275, 2016.
- [42] X. He, Z. Zhang, M. AlSinan, Y. Li, H. Kwak, et al., "Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis of Multi-Phase Flow in Fractured Rocks: A Pore-To-Field Scale Investigation," in SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Houston, Texas, USA, p. D022S090R001, 2022.
- [43] X. Ma, B. Chang, and M. Prodanovi´c, "Direct Pore-Scale Modeling of Foam Flow through Rough Fractures," *Energy & Fuels*, vol. 38, no. 15, pp. 14449–14460, 2024.
- [44] Y. Qiu, K. Xu, A. A. Pahlavan, and R. Juanes, "Wetting transition and fluid trapping in a microfluidic fracture," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 120, no. 22, p. e2303515120, 2023.
- [45] G. B. Cunha, C. I. McDermott, A. Bond, A. Fraser-Harris, and R. E. Rizzo, "Advancements in coupled processes numerical models: Upscaling aperture fields using spatial continuity," *iScience*, vol. 27, no. 11, p. 111094, 2024.

- [46] M. Quintard and S. Whitaker, "Two phase flow in heterogeneous porous media: the method of large-scale averaging," *Transport* in *Porous Media*, vol. 3, pp. 357–413, 1987.
- [47] M. Betancourt, "A Conceptual Introduction to Hamiltonian Monte Carlo," 2018.