



This is Fig. 4b from Ryu & Jones (1995, ApJ, 442, 228), showing the solution of the MHD shock tube problem with the left state $(\rho, v_1, v_2, v_3, B_2, B_3, p_1) = [0.4, -0.66991, 0.98263, 0, 0.0025293, 0, 0.52467]$ and the right state [1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1] with $B_1 = 1.3$ 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) contact discontinuity (at $x_1 \sim 0.4$), and (2) "switch-off" fast-rarefaction (at $0.63 < x_1 < 0.78$). See Problem 15 in the 1-D Gallery for a definition of a "switch-off" wave.

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=0.2. Analytical solutions from the non-linear Riemann solver described in Ryu & Jones are unavailable for this problem.

There are no significant differences between the dzeus36 and dzeus35 solutions. The apparent "undershoot" at the base of the rarefaction in e_T is real. The two "glitches" at $x_1 \sim 0.18$ and $x_1 \sim 0.58$ are numerical in origin and appear in fully upwinded schemes too. They are slow "transient waves" launched by the hyper-resolved (one zone) discontinuity in the initial conditions.