

# Analysis of Leakage Failure in Coiled Tubing

Runqiu Gao, Dong Jian and Yueming Liu

DSHINDA(TANGSHAN) CREATIVE OIL & GAS EQUIPMENT CO.,LTD, Tangshan 063000, China

**Abstract:** The material test results show that the chemical composition, size, grain size and hardness test results of the fractured coiled tubing meet the standard requirements, and no abnormal results are found. There are mechanical trauma in the fracture and suspected improper operation on both sides of the fracture position, which causes the tube body damage by the stacking of the clamping blocks, that will cause the deformation of the coiled tubing. The thinning of the wall thickness and the increase of hardness will reduce the strength of the tubing, which is the main reason for the fracture of the coiled tubing.

**Keywords:** Coiled tubing, Leakage Failure, Thinning of the wall thickness, Increase of hardness.

## 1. Introduction

SHINDA (TANGSHAN) CREATIVE OIL & GAS EQUIPMENT CO., LTD produced a disc of  $\phi 38.1 \times 3.2$  ST90 coiled tubing with a length of 2300m, fracture occurs during operation. The fracture position was 1078m, and the customer ran the well for a total of 7 times.

The broken tubes with obvious trauma were numbered A1, and the remaining tubes were numbered A2, to analyze the sample [1].




Figure 1. Causing lateral damage exist at both ends of the fractured tubing




Figure 2. Overall morphology of fracture

## 2. Test Methods and Results




Figure 3. The location near the fracture

### 2.1. Chemical Composition Analysis

According to ASTM A751-2021, Labspark1000 direct reading spectrometer was used to sample A1 for chemical composition analysis, and the results were shown in Table 1. It can be seen from the analysis results that the chemical composition of the sample meets the technical requirements [2].

Table 1. Chemical composition test results

sample number	Element content (wt%)										
	C	Si	Mn	P	S	Cu	Ni	Cr	Mo	Nb	Ti
A1	0.141	0.137	0.897	0.014	0.001	0.290	0.141	0.593	0.268	0.018	0.016
Technical requirements	$\leq 0.16$	$\leq 0.50$	$\leq 1.20$	$\leq 0.020$	$\leq 0.005$	/	/	/	/	/	/


### 2.2. Dimension Measurement

The outer diameter and wall thickness of the unbroken end of A1 and A2 tubes are tested along the axis according to the

positions shown in A-A, B-B, C-C and D-D. The results are shown in Table 2 below. The results show that the specifications of tubes meet the standard requirements.

**Table 2.** Dimensional measurement result

Measuring position	A-A	B-B	C-C	D-D	t1	t2	t3	t4
A1/mm	38.30	38.25	38.28	38.26	3.34	3.31	3.31	3.31
A2/mm	38.31	38.22	38.28	38.17	3.32	3.32	3.31	3.34
Acceptance standard/mm	37.85~38.35				3~3.5			




### 2.3. Metallographic Analysis of Tube Cross Section Near Fracture Location


Cut off a section of tube ring near the A2 fracture, for A2, YJ-2000 metallographic microscope and image analysis system were used to conduct grain size analysis according to ASTM E112-2013 standard. The results are shown in Table 3. The results show that the grain size of the sample meets the technical requirements, metallographic structure was not abnormal.

**Table 3.** Results of grain size rating


A2	grain size
Weld	10.5
HAZ	10.5
Base material	11.5
standard request	≥8




**Figure 6.** Base material 500X



**Figure 4.** Weld 500X




**Figure 5.** HAZ 500X



**Figure 7.** Macroscopic surface of metallographic corrosion 6.8X

### 2.4. Hardness Testing of Tube Cross Section Near Fracture Location

Cut off a section of tube ring near the A2 fracture, for A2, 200HVS-5 digital display small-load Vickers hardness tester was used to perform the hardness test according to ASTM E384-22 standards, and the hardness conversion was performed according to ASTM E140-2012b (2019) e1. The hardness test position of the original tube is shown in Figure 8, and the data are shown in Table 4. The results show that, the hardness data meet the technical requirements and the hardness is uniform.



**Figure 8.** Through-wall Hardness Test Impression Location

**Table 4. Hardness test result**


A2	Weld line			HAZ			Base material			90°zone			180°zone		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Measured value	98.5	98.5	98.5	97.0	97.0	97.0	97.0	96.5	97.0	96.0	97.0	96.5	98.5	98.5	98.0
Average	98.5HRB			97.0HRB			97.0HRB			96.5HRB			98.5HRB		
Test Requirement	≤22HRC (248HV) Below 20 HRC, HRB is used														

## 2.5. Metallographic Analysis of Fracture


Sample the area of the A1 tube containing the injury, YJ-2000 metallographic microscope and image analysis system were used to conduct grain size analysis according to ASTM E112-2013 standard. The results are shown in Table 5. The results show that the grain size of the sample meets the technical requirements, However, the wall thickness at the damaged site became thinner and deformed.

**Table 5. Results of grain size rating**

A1	grain size
Base material	11.0
standard request	≥8



**Figure 9. Base material 500X**



**Figure 10. Macroscopic surface 6.8X**




Fracture has damage different from fracture deformation, which is not caused by tube fracture, but by external machinery. Taking out this part for testing, it is found that the hardness of this part is higher than that of the matrix, which reduces the plastic toughness of the tube.

**Figure 11. The macroscopic picture shows obvious deformation and the wall thickness at the breaking point is reduced 6.8X**


Sample A2 was sampled at the location of the tube side damage that may have been caused by the clamping block, YJ-2000 metallographic microscope and image analysis system were used to conduct grain size analysis according to ASTM E112-2013 standard. The results are shown in Table 6. The results show that the grain size of the sample meets the technical requirements, However, the wall thickness at the damaged site became deformed [3].

**Table 6. Results of grain size rating**

A2	grain size
Base material	11.0
standard request	≥8



**Figure 12. Base material 500X**



**Figure 13. Macroscopic surface 6.8X**




Figure 14. The macroscopic picture shows the wall thickness at the damaged site became deformed 6.8X

## 2.6. Hardness Testing of Fracture

For A1 and A2 damage sites, hardness tests were performed using a 200HVS-5 digital display small load Vickers hardness

tester according to ASTM E384-22, hardness conversion according to ASTM E140-2012b (2019) e1. The data are shown in Table 7. The results show that the hardness of the damaged site is higher than that of the tube and is not uniform.

Table 7. Hardness test result

A1	Damage location			Base material-1			Base material-2		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Measured value	100.0	99.0	97.0	99.5	98.0	98.0	99.0	97.5	98.0
A2	Damage location			Base material-1			Base material-2		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Measured value	99.0	98.0	96.0	98.0	97.0	96.0	98.5	98.0	96.5
Test Requirement	≤22HRC (248HV)								
	Below 20 HRC, HRB is used								

## 3. Summary

There is mechanical trauma in the fracture and suspected improper operation on both sides of the fracture position, which causes the tube body damage by the stacking of the clamping blocks, that will cause the deformation of the coiled tubing. The thinning of the wall thickness and the increase of hardness will reduce the strength of the tubing, which is the main reason for the fracture of the coiled tubing [4].

## Acknowledgements

Central Government's Guidance for Local Science and Technology Development Fund Project (Science and Technology Achievements Transfer and Transformation

Project) No.236Z1022G.

## References

- [1] Bi Zongyue, Jing Xiaotian, Jin Shilin, et al. Performance Research and Product Development of Coiled Tubing [J]. Oil Field Equipment, 2010, 39(6): 16 - 20.
- [2] Zhou Zhaoming, Wan Fu, Li Weiqin, et al. Review of Coiled Tubing Detection Technology [J]. Oil Field Equipment, 2011, 40(4): 9 - 12.
- [3] Wang Youqiang, Zhang Siwei, Fang Aiguo. Overview of Failure Modes and Causes of Coiled Tubing [J]. Oil Field Equipment, 1999, 28(4): 15 - 18.
- [4] Li Bin. Failure Mechanism and Cause Analysis of Coiled Tubing [J]. China Petroleum Machinery, 2007, 35(12): 73 - 76.