



This is Fig. 4a from Ryu & Jones (1995, ApJ, 442, 228), showing the solution of the MHD shock tube problem with the left state $(\rho, v_1, v_2, v_3, B_2, B_3, p_1) = [1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1]$ and the right state [0.2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]with $B_1 = 1$ and $\gamma = 5/3$ at time t = 0.15. At t = 0, the discontinuity is at $x_1 = 0.5$. Plots show from left to right: (1) fast rarefaction, (2) slow rarefaction (at $x_1 \sim 0.45$), (3) contact discontinuity (at $x_1 \sim 0.64$), (4) slow shock (at $x_1 \sim 0.75$), and (5) "switch-on" fast shock.

Open circles are the dzeus36 solution using 512 zones, CMoC, the total energy equation, and thirdorder interpolation with the contact steepener engaged. dzeus36 parameters controlling the time step and artificial viscosity are: courno=0.75, qcon=1.0, and qlin=0.0. Lines are the results from the non-linear Riemann solver described in Ryu & Jones.

There are no significant differences between the dzeus36 and dzeus35 solutions. The slight undershoot in ρ at the base of the contact disappears when second-order interpolation is used, but this smears the contact over several zones.

Switch-on waves have the property of creating a component of B_{\perp} where there was none before the wave's passage. Fast shocks and slow rarefactions can be *switch-on*, while slow shocks and fast rarefactions can be *switch-off* (destroying B_{\perp} upon wave's passage).