



This is Fig. 5*a* 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 [0.125, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0.1] with  $B_1 = 0.75$  and  $\gamma = 5/3$  (Brio & Wu used  $\gamma = 2.0$ ) at time t = 0.1. At t = 0, the discontinuity is at  $x_1 = 0.5$ . Plots show from left to right: (1) fast rarefaction, (2) slow compound wave (at  $x_1 \sim 0.47$ ), (3) contact discontinuity (at  $x_1 \sim 0.56$ ), (4) slow shock (at  $x_1 \sim 0.63$ ), and (5) fast rarefaction.

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=0.5. 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 slow compound wave consists of an intermediate shock attached to a slow rarefaction, and is found in virtually all numerical solutions. In a non-dissipative analytical solution, the compound wave is replaced by a rotational discontinuity followed closely by a slow shock. As a consequence of mass conservation, the levels in  $\rho$  in the vicinity of the compound wave do not match those in the analytical solution. The higher than normal *linear* viscosity parameter (qlin=0.5) is to calm the velocity oscillations at the foot of the fast rarefaction.