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Abstract—A method for simulating flow around the solid bodies has been presented using hybrid meshfree and mesh-based schemes. The present scheme optimizes the computational efficiency by combining the advantages of both meshfree and mesh-based methods. In this approach, a cloud of meshfree nodes has been used in the domain around the solid body. These meshfree nodes have the ability to efficiently adapt to complex geometrical shapes. In the rest of the domain, conventional Cartesian grid has been used beyond the meshfree cloud. Complex geometrical shapes can therefore be dealt efficiently by using meshfree nodal cloud and computational efficiency is maintained through the use of conventional mesh-based scheme on Cartesian grid in the larger part of the domain. Spatial discretization of meshfree nodes has been achieved through local radial basis functions in finite difference mode (RBF-FD). Conventional finite difference scheme has been used in the Cartesian ‘meshed’ domain. Accuracy tests of the hybrid scheme have been conducted to establish the order of accuracy. Numerical tests have been performed by simulating two dimensional steady and unsteady incompressible flows around cylindrical object. Steady flow cases have been run at Reynolds numbers of 10, 20 and 40 and unsteady flow problems have been studied at Reynolds numbers of 100 and 200. Flow Parameters including lift, drag, vortex shedding, and vorticity contours are calculated. Numerical results have been found to be in good agreement with computational and experimental results available in the literature.
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I. INTRODUCTION

MESHFREE or meshless methods have emerged as a new class of numerical techniques during past few years. One of the common characteristics of these methods is that they eliminate, at least, the structure of the mesh by approximating the solution over a set of arbitrarily distributed data points (or nodes) [4]-[9]. There is no requirement pre-selected connectivity or relationship amongst the nodes of meshless domain. Meshfree methods can also deal with complex geometries and irregular boundaries more efficiently. Moreover, computational ease of adding or removing nodes from the domain is another attractive advantage of meshless methods. Meshless methods therefore have the potential to alleviate the mesh generation complexities arising in traditional methods like Finite Difference (FD), Finite Volume (FV) and Finite Element (FE) methods and significantly reduce the computational cost associated with grid generation. Due to these features, meshless methods have become one of the hottest areas of research in computational fluid dynamics [12]-[19]. However, despite their stated advantages, meshless methods possess overall lesser computational efficiency than traditional mesh based methods like FD, FV and FE [21]. This in fact, is the major limitation which impedes the wide applicability of meshless methods [11].

Radial Basis Functions (RBFs) have been used for many years for multivariate data and function interpolation. In 90s, use of RBFs was proposed for the solution of Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) [25]. Lately there has been great interest of researchers to use RBFs for solution of PDEs on irregular domains by collocation approach [12], [25]-[27]. Local RBF methods have also been proposed to overcome the ill-conditioning problem associated with dense, large sized matrices. Local RBF's compromise on spectral accuracy and produce well-conditioned and sparse linear systems which are capable of efficiently handling the non-linearities[17]. These methods are therefore considered well suited for fluid dynamics problems which involve large number of data points in meshfree domains. RBF in Finite Difference Mode (RBF-FD) is a local RBF method which was independently proposed by Tolstykh et al. [29] and Wright et al. [30] for different set of applications. RBF-FD allows the use of Finite Difference method on randomly distributed data points (or nodes). The method has been successfully applied to various fluid dynamics problems involving incompressible Navier Stokes equations [27], [32].

Like other Meshfree methods, RBF based methods also suffer from high computational cost compared with conventional mesh based methods. For example, calculation of RBF's weights corresponding to the neighbouring particles of a data point requires expensive square root and matrix inversion processes. Moreover, calculation of derivative approximation at a given order of accuracy usually requires much more number of neighboring particles (or nodes) for meshfree methods on irregular grid than for finite difference methods on Cartesian grid. As a result, the bandwidth of matrices representing the governing algebraic equations greatly expands in case of meshfree methods [11]. Therefore, the iteration process is slowed down due to relatively dense matrix equations and the computational efficiency is reduced. At the same time, meshfree methods have the advantage to efficiently deal with complex geometry.

Conventional mesh-based methods (e.g. FD, FV and FE methods) offer better computational efficiency over
meshfree methods. However, generation of an efficient mesh, which could ensure accurate results, is generally a tedious and time consuming task. Cartesian grid is generally considered to be much more efficient to generate but it cannot be applied to complex geometries. In order to cope with this problem, coupled multi-grid methods have been proposed [33]-[35]. However these methods rely on interpolation approximations at the grid interchanges and suffer from inaccuracies especially when high gradients exist at these junctures. Some researchers have also proposed the use of Cartesian grids on irregular shapes using boundary-fitted methods [36]-[38]. However, these methods necessitate special treatments close to the boundary and suffer from time step restrictions due to small cut cell to accurately embed irregular boundaries in the Cartesian grid. Another approach is to use non-body conformal methods [39], [40] in which a background structured mesh is defined behind the solid boundary. The interface between fluid and solid is traced using ‘marker nodes’. These schemes however suffer from inaccuracies coming from accurate tracing of the boundary which is limited by the grid resolution.

In view of the foregone, it is logical to come up with a technique which combines the inherent strengths of both meshfree and mesh-based methods. Here, a hybrid technique is presented to simulate incompressible flow around arbitrarily shaped solid objects. The method has been shown to be stable and produce accurate results in the regions of gradients high field variables. Detail of temporal and spatial discretization is described below.

II. FORMULATION OF PROBLEM

A. Governing Equations

Incompressible, transient, viscous Navier-Stokes equations in non-dimensional pressure-velocity form are expressed as:

\[ \nabla \cdot \vec{v} = 0 \]
\[ \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial t} = -\nabla P - (\vec{v} \cdot \nabla)\vec{v} + (1/Re)\nabla^2 \vec{v} \]  

where \( \vec{v} \) is the velocity vector, \( P \) is the pressure, and \( Re \) is the Reynolds number. The equations are discretized using time implicit RBF-FD method proposed by Javed et al [41]. The method has been shown to be stable and produce accurate results in the regions of gradients high field variables. Detail of temporal and spatial discretization is described below.

B. Time Splitting

Time splitting of the governing equations has been achieved using implicit fractional step method [41]. In this method, convective term of momentum equation is treated with 2nd order explicit Adam-Bashforth scheme whereas viscous term is decomposed using 2nd order implicit Crank-Nicholson scheme [42].
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Equation (2) therefore assumes the following form:

\[
(\vec{v}^n - \vec{v}^{n-1})/\partial t = -1/2\left[3\left(\vec{v}^n, \nabla \vec{v}^n - (\vec{v}^{n-1}, \nabla \vec{v}^{n-1})\right) + 1/(2\epsilon)\nabla^2(\vec{v}^n + \vec{v}^{n-1})\right]
\]  

(3)

Superscripts \(n\) and \(n-1\) represent the iteration number and \(v^*\) represents the intermediate velocity. The pressure term appearing in momentum (2) can be linked with velocity as:

\[
(\vec{v}^{n+1} - \vec{v}^*)/\partial t = -\nabla p^{n+1}
\]  

(4)

Now, from continuity condition (1):

\[
\nabla \cdot \vec{v}^{n+1} = 0
\]  

(5)

Substituting the value of \(\vec{v}^{n+1}\) from (4) into (5) leads to,

\[
\nabla^2 p^{n+1} = (1/\Delta t)\nabla \cdot \vec{v}^*
\]  

(6)

Equation (6) is called pressure Poisson equation. By incorporating pressure term into continuity equation, the continuity is satisfied in the process of solution of transient flow problem.

C. Space Splitting

As mentioned before, space splitting has been achieved using RBF-FD in meshfreezone.RBF in finite difference mode (RBF-FD) is the generalization of classical finite difference method over scattered data points (or nodes) using Radial Basis Functions. The standard RBF interpolation for a set of distinct points \(x_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^d, j = 1, 2, \ldots, N\) is given by [32]:

\[
u(x) \approx s(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j \phi \left(\left|\left| x - x_j \right|\right| \right) + \beta
\]  

(7)

where, \(\phi \left(\left|\left| x - x_j \right|\right| \right)\) is a radial basis function, \(\left|\left| \cdot \right|\right|\) is a standard Euclidean norm and \(\lambda\) and \(\beta\) are expansion coefficients. Some of the common radial basis functions are given in Table 1. \(r\) is the radial distance between two data points and \(\sigma\) is the shape function. Equation (7) can be written in Lagrange form as:

\[
s(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j \phi \left(\left|\left| x - x_j \right|\right| \right) u(x_j)
\]  

(8)

where, \(\phi \left(\left|\left| x - x_j \right|\right| \right)\) is of the form (7) and satisfies the cardinal conditions as

\[
\phi \left(\left|\left| x_k - x_j \right|\right| \right) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k = j \\ 0, & \text{if } k \neq j, k = 1, 2, \ldots, n \end{cases}
\]  

(9)

Applying a differential operator \(L\) on (8) at node \(x_1\), as shown in Fig. 2, yields:

\[
Lu(x_1) \approx Ls(x_1) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j \phi \left(\left|\left| x_1 - x_j \right|\right| \right) u(x_j)
\]  

(10)

Using classical finite difference approach, the derivative of any parameter \(u\) at any node, say \(x_1\), can be expressed as weighted linear sum of same variable values at surrounding nodes in the support domain. Therefore,

\[
Lu(x_1) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} w^{(L)}_{(1,j)} u(x_j)
\]  

(11)

where \(N\) is the number of nodes in the support domain of nodex_1, \(u(x_j)\) is the value of parameter \(u\) at node \(x_j\) and \(w^{(L)}_{(1,j)}\) is the weight of corresponding differential operator \(L\) at node \(x_1\) for node \(x_1\) as shown in Fig. 2. Comparing (10) and (11), the weights \(w^{(L)}_{(1,j)}\) can be written as:

\[
w^{(L)}_{(1,j)} = L \phi \left(\left|\left| x_1 - x_j \right|\right| \right)
\]  

(12)

In practice, RBF weights can be computed by solving the following linear system [27]:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Phi e^T \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix}
u \\
\mu
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathcal{L} \Phi e^T \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(13)

where \(\mathcal{L} \Phi e^T\) represents the column vector \(\mathcal{L} \phi \left(\left|\left| x - x_1 \right|\right| \right) \mathcal{L} \phi \left(\left|\left| x - x_2 \right|\right| \right) \ldots \mathcal{L} \phi \left(\left|\left| x - x_n \right|\right| \right)^T\) evaluated at node \(x_1\) and \(\mu\) is a scalar parameter which enforces the condition:

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} w^{(L)}_{(1,j)} = 0
\]  

(14)

Evaluation of (13) at each node, say \(x_1\), gives weights \(w^{(L)}_{(1,j)}\) of all the nodes in the support domain for particular differential operator \(L\). Corresponding weights and locations of nodes in support domains are then used to approximate the complete differential equation at nodex_1. The procedure repeated to approximate the differential equations at all the node in domain.

Fig. 2 Support domain of a reference node
Classical finite difference method has been used in Cartesian grid zone to improve computational efficiency of the solution. At time iteration \( n \), 1st and 2nd spatial derivatives of a variable \( u \) with respect to \( x \), can be approximated at node \((i,j)\) using central difference schemes on a standard 2-D Cartesian grid (see Fig. 3) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u^n}{\partial x}(i,j) & \approx \frac{u^n_{i+1,j} - u^n_{i-1,j}}{2\Delta x} \\
\frac{\partial^2 u^n}{\partial x^2}(i,j) & \approx \frac{u^n_{i+1,j} - 2u^n_{i,j} + u^n_{i-1,j}}{\Delta x^2}
\end{align*}
\]

Spatial discretization is to be decided by corresponding meshfree / Cartesian zone of the particular node. Separate Matrix equations can be formulated, for meshfree and Cartesian nodes, by writing governing equations ((3) and (6)) in discretized form at each node of the domain. Solution of these equations results nodal pressure and intermediate velocity values at each time step. Subsequently, velocity values at next time iteration can be calculated using (4).

Spatial Accuracy of the presented method has been found to be calculated at meshfree zone. For this calculation, the boundary conditions at the solid surface and field variable values at Cat-B nodes are used. After having calculated the results in meshfree zone, standard finite difference scheme is used to calculate results in Cartesian zone. For this, nodes at the outer boundary of meshfree cloud provide the boundary conditions to Cartesian nodes. In addition to this, the boundary conditions at outer boundaries of domain are also used.

**III. NUMERICAL TESTS**

**A. Calculation of Order of Accuracy**

Spatial Accuracy of the presented method has been found by simulating the decaying vortex on hybrid grid. Analytical solution of decaying vortex case is known. Therefore, the test is often used by researchers to verify the accuracy of new methods [21], [42], [44], [45]. Theoretical expressions for velocity and pressure fields for this case are given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
u(x, y, t) &= -\cos(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)\exp(-2\pi^2 t/Re) \\
v(x, y, t) &= \sin(\pi x)\cos(\pi y)\exp(-2\pi^2 t/Re) \\
p(x, y, t) &= -0.25[\cos(2\pi x) + \sin(2\pi y)]\exp(-4\pi^2 t/Re)
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \( Re \) is the flow Reynolds number which is taken as \( Re = \rho u_0 L/\mu \) (\( \rho \) is the flow density, \( u_0 \) is the maximum velocity at \( t=0 \), \( \mu \) is the dynamic viscosity and \( L \) is the length of the vortex). Numerical simulations are carried out on a rectangular domain with dimensions \([-0.5x0.5][-0.5x0.5]\).
The central region of the rectangle with dimensions \([-0.25 \times 0.25] \times [-0.25 \times 0.25]\) comprises of meshfree zone. The surrounding domain is represented by Cartesian nodes as shown in Fig. 5. Randomness has been introduced in meshfree zone by disturbing the meshfree nodes from their original (Cartesian) positions. However, in order to maintain uniformity in distribution of meshfree nodes, perturbation in the position of meshfree nodes has been limited to 20% of the grid spacing. Three layers of Cat-B nodes have been introduced outside the meshfree zone.

The initial conditions are introduced at each node of the domain using the velocity and pressure values obtained from (32)-(34) at \(t=0\). Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed on all the four boundary using theoretical expressions at given time values. The values of field variables for subsequent time iterations are calculated at inner nodes using the method outlined in Section II. The time step value is chosen to be \(10^{-5}\) sec. Flow Reynolds number is set as \(R=10\). Simulation is run for duration of 0.4 sec. The error is calculated by comparing the numerical results with theoretical values obtained by evaluating (32)-(34) at each node. Spatial accuracy is calculated by changing the grid size and calculating norm-2 of the error for pressure and velocity values. The error for pressure values for changing grid size is shown in Fig. 6. The slope of error versus grid size curve on a logarithmic plot yields the order of spatial accuracy of the method. The order of accuracy is 3.95 for pressure and 3.8 for velocity.

**B. Flow around Cylinder**

Validation of presented numerical method has been demonstrated by simulating steady and unsteady flows around cylindrical body. The problem has been studied by various researchers [2], [11], [20]-[22], [31], [43]. Therefore, sufficient reliable data is available in the literature, for various cases, to compare with. The flow around cylindrical objects remains steady at low Reynolds numbers \((Re < 49)\). However an oscillating Vortex Street (known as Kamran Vortex) is observed behind the cylinder, at higher values of Reynolds number \((49 \leq Re \leq 200)\), making the problem unsteady. Reynolds number is calculated as \(Re = \rho UD / \mu\), where \(\rho\) is the fluid density, \(U\) is the free stream velocity, \(D\) is the diameter of the cylinder and \(\mu\) is the dynamic viscosity of the fluid. Configuration of problem is shown in Fig. 7. The circular body represents the cross section of cylindrical object in a 2-D domain. The upper and lower walls are at a distance of \(16D\). The Inlet and outlet boundaries are kept at distances of \(8D\) and \(30D\) from the center of the cylinder respectively. This ensures that the flow at the solid boundary is not affected by the boundary conditions at outer domain boundaries. Lengths of sides of the meshfree domain are 3 times the diameter of cylinder. Therefore, meshfree zone constitutes only 1.35% of the total domain size.

![Fig. 6 Order of Accuracy in Space](image6)

![Fig. 7 Configuration of 2-D Domain for simulation of flow around cylindrical objects](image7)
TABLE II
COMPARISON OF SEPARATION ANGLE (θ_sep), LENGTH OF RECIRCULATION REGION (L_{sep}) AND DRAG COEFFICIENT (C_D) AT Re 10, 20 AND 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>θ_{sep}</th>
<th>L_{sep}</th>
<th>C_D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dennis and Chang [1]</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Takami and Keller [3]</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Taunn and Olson [20]</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ding et al [18]</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>He and Doolen [23]</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mei and Shyy [24]</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guo et al [28]</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chew et al [21]</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Firoozjaee et al [31]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Present Study</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dennis and Chang [1]</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Takami and Keller [3]</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Taunn and Olson [20]</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ding et al [18]</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>He and Doolen [23]</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>2.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mei and Shyy [24]</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Guo et al [28]</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chew et al [21]</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Firoozjaee et al [31]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Present Study</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fornberg [43]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Dennis and Chang [1]</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Takami and Keller [3]</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Taunn and Olson [20]</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ding et al [18]</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>He and Doolen [23]</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mei and Shyy [24]</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Guo et al [28]</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Chew et al [21]</td>
<td>53.47</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Firoozjaee et al [31]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Present Study</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inflow boundary conditions (u = U, v = 0, where U is the free stream velocity) are applied at the inlet. No slip boundary conditions (u = v = 0) have been introduced at the solid boundary. No slip boundary condition implies that ∂p/∂n = 0 (where n is the outward normal direction to the boundary). Therefore, Neumann boundary conditions for pressure are introduced at solid boundary. At the outlet, outflow boundary conditions are met using the expression ∂u/∂t + ∂u/∂x = 0. At top and bottom boundary, ∂u/∂y = 0, v = 0 is applied.

The nodal arrangement used for the problem is shown in Fig. 8 (a). A total of 100 nodes are placed on the circular solid boundary. The domain is represented by 2895 meshfree nodes (arranged radially) and 32088 Cartesian nodes. Therefore, computationally expensive meshfree scheme will be used at only 8.3% nodes of the domain. In order to implement Neumann boundary condition at solid boundary, first two layers of nodes around the solid are arranged orthogonally with the boundary nodes as shown in Fig. 8 (b). The condition of orthogonal grid at the outlet boundary is naturally satisfied due to Cartesian grid.

Lift and drag forces at the solid boundary are evaluated by summing up vertical and horizontal components of pressure and viscous forces at all the boundary nodes as shown in Fig. 9. Lift (F_L) and drag (F_D) forces can therefore be expressed as:

\[ F_L = \rho U^2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} \left( -P_i \sin \theta_i r d\theta + \frac{1}{Re} \omega_i \cos \theta_i d\theta \right) \right) \] (20)
\[ F_D = \rho U^2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} \left( -P_i \cos \theta_i, r d \theta_i - \frac{1}{Re} \omega_i \sin \theta_i d \theta_i \right) \right) \]  

(21)

where \( P_i \) and \( \omega_i \) are the pressure and vorticity values at boundary node \( i \), \( n_s \) is the number of nodes at solid boundary, \( r \) is the radius of circle, \( \theta_i \) is the angular position of the node \( i \) from horizontal (as shown in Fig.9) and \( d \theta \) is the angular displacement between two consecutive boundary nodes. The lift and drag coefficients (\( C_D \) and \( C_L \)) around the solid boundary are then evaluated using following expressions:

\[
\text{Lift coefficient} = C_L = \frac{F_L}{\rho U^2} \tag{22}
\]

\[
\text{Drag coefficient} = C_D = \frac{F_D}{\rho U^2} \tag{23}
\]

In order to simulate unsteady flow around the cylindrical objects, the flow solutions have been calculated at Re 100 and 200. Time step has been chosen to be 2.5x10^{-3} sec. At these flow conditions, oscillating vortices are obtained behind the solid object. The oscillating vortex profile is captured at various time instances for a complete cycle, and shown in Figs. 11 and 12 for Re 100 and 200, respectively. The oscillatory flow also results in corresponding fluctuation in lift and drag forces over the body. Variation of \( C_L \) and \( C_D \) with frequency of oscillation tend to increase with the increase in Reynolds number. At both Reynolds number, frequency of oscillation of drag coefficient is twice the corresponding oscillation frequency of lift coefficient. Frequency of oscillation can be represented in terms of Strouhal number which is equal to the vortex shedding frequency in case of non-dimensionalized length and time parameters. Therefore, Strouhal number can directly be acquired by frequency of oscillation of \( C_L \) versus time plot.

The numerical solutions have been verified by comparing the resultant values of lift and drag coefficients and Strouhal number with results of previous researchers, as shown in Table III. The results show good agreement with the previous solutions [2], [10], [11], [21], [22].

A comparison of computational time between hybrid and fully meshfree schemes was carried out on a grid containing 18026 nodes at flow Reynolds number 100. The simulation was run on Intel ® 3.1 GHz Processor machine and CPU time for every 100 iterations was monitored. Average CPU time for fully meshfree scheme was found to be 468.3 sec compared with the average CPU time of 38.72 sec for Hybrid scheme. Thus the computation time was reduced by almost a factor of 12 with the use of Hybrid scheme. More over due to fewer meshfree nodes used in Hybrid approach, RBF-FD weight calculation time was also reduced by a factor of 6 compared with fully meshfree approach. Therefore significant improvement in computational time was achieved using hybrid approach.

**TABLE III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( C_L )</th>
<th>( C_D )</th>
<th>Str</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Braza et al [2]</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>1.364x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Liu et al [10]</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.350x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ding et al [11]</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1.325x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>C.Shu et al [21]</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.362x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Present Study</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>1.355x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Belovetov[22]</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>1.19x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Braza et al [2]</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>1.40x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Liu et al [10]</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>1.31x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Ding et al [11]</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>1.327x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>C.Shu et al [21]</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.325x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Present Study</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>1.354x10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 10 Vorticity profiles at Re 10, 20 and 40**
IV. CONCLUSION

RBF-FD is a highly flexible meshless method which is known for accurate and efficient approximation the derivatives of field variables on a meshless domain. However, like other meshless methods, it lacks computational efficiency compared with the conventional mesh based methods. The proposed hybrid scheme therefore couples both the meshless and mesh-based methods on a hybrid grid.

The hybrid scheme is used to simulate incompressible flow past circular cylinder. Implicit treatment of time marching is implemented to achieve better stability of the iteration process. The overall hybrid scheme is found to have spatial order of accuracy greater than 3.8 for both pressure and velocity results on a hybrid meshfree-Cartesian grid with rectangular domain. Numerical tests are performed to demonstrate the application of presented method for steady and unsteady flow problems. Accurate solutions have been obtained by using the presented scheme with the use of significantly less computational resources.
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