The Piecewise Cubic Method (PCM) for Computational Fluid Dynamics

Dongwook Lee^{a,*}, Hugues Faller^{a,c}, Adam Reyes^b

^a*Applied Mathematics and Statistics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, U.S.A*

^b*Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, U.S.A*

^c*Département de Physique, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, France*

Abstract

We present a new high-order finite volume reconstruction method for hyperbolic conservation laws. The method is based on a piecewise cubic polynomial which provides its solutions a fifth-order accuracy in space. The spatially reconstructed solutions are evolved in time with a fourth-order accuracy by tracing the characteristics of the cubic polynomials. As a result, our temporal update scheme provides a significantly simpler and computationally more efficient approach in achieving fourth order accuracy in time, relative to the comparable fourth-order Runge-Kutta method. We demonstrate that the solutions of PCM converges at fifth-order in solving 1D smooth flows described by hyperbolic conservation laws. We test the new scheme on a range of numerical experiments, including both gas dynamics and magnetohydrodynamics applications in multiple spatial dimensions.

Keywords: High-order methods; piecewise cubic method; finite volume method; gas dynamics; magnetohydrodynamics; Godunov's method.

*Corresponding author

Email address: dlee79@ucsc.edu (Dongwook Lee)

1. Introduction

In this paper we are interested in solving multidimensional conservation laws of the Euler equations and the ideal MHD equations, written as

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{U}) = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{U}$ is the vector of the conservative variables, and

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{U}) = [F(\mathbf{U}), G(\mathbf{U}), H(\mathbf{U})]^T = [\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}]^T \quad (2)$$

5 is the flux vector.

We present a new high-order piecewise cubic method (PCM) algorithm that is extracted from the classical PPM [1] and WENO schemes [2, 3]. These two algorithms, by far, have been extremely successful in various scientific fields where there are challenging computational needs for *both* high-order accuracy
10 in smooth flows and well-resolved solutions in shock/discontinuous flows. With the advent of high-performance computing (HPC) in recent years, such needs have been more and more desired, and have become a necessary requirement in conducting large scale, cutting edge simulations of gas dynamics and magneto-hydrodynamics (MHD) [4, 5, 6, 7].

15 As observed in the success stories of the PPM and WENO methods, discrete algorithms of data interpolation and reconstruction play a key role in numerical methods for PDE approximations [8, 9, 10] within the broad framework of finite difference and finite volume discretization methods. In view of this, computational improvements of such interpolation and reconstruction schemes,
20 particularly focused on the high-order property with great shock-capturing capability, take their positions at the center of HPC in modern computational fluid dynamics.

The properties of enhanced solution accuracy with lower numerical errors on a given grid resolution and faster convergence-to-solution rates are the key
25 advantages in high-order schemes. The advantage of using high-order methods in HPC is therefore clear: one can obtain reproducible, admissible, and highly

accurate numerical solutions in a faster computational time at the expense of increased rate of floating point operations, while at the same time, with the use of smaller size of grid resolutions. This is by no means exceedingly efficient in
 30 high-performance computing (HPC), in view of the fact that the increase of grid resolutions has a direct impact to an increase of memory footprints which are bounded in all modern computing architecture.

In this regards, our goal in this paper is to lay down a mathematical foundation in designing a new high-order method using piecewise cubic polynomials.
 35 For the scope of the current paper we focus on describing the detailed PCM algorithm in 1D finite volume framework in which a fourth order PCM reconstruction is formulated in each normal dimension without cross derivative terms. For multidimensional problems we adopt the classical [‡] *dimension-by-dimension* [12] approach for simplicity, where a fourth order PCM reconstruction
 40 in each normal direction is used to compute second order time averaged normal fluxes. The multidimensional conservation laws are updated using a directionally unsplit fashion. Although this approach has an advantage in its simplicity, it unfortunately fails to retain the high-order accurate property of the 1D baseline algorithm in multidimensional problems. Instead, it provides
 45 only a second-order accuracy in multidimensional nonlinear advection in finite volume method due to the lack of accuracy in approximating a face-averaged flux function as a result of mis-using an averaged quantity in place of a point-wise quantity, or vice versa [11, 12, 13, 14]. We understand that the baseline 1D PCM scheme can be extended to multiple spatial dimensions preserving its
 50 high-order accuracy by following more sophisticated treatments in two different ways. A first approach can be a traditional approach of combining high-order spatial reconstructions and high-order Runge-Kutta (RK) temporal updates [11, 12, 13, 14]. Alternatively, a second approach can be available with more

[‡]This approach is the same as the Class A approach in [13], and should not be confused with the so-called dimensionally split approach. Our spatial integration scheme in this paper is directionally unsplit.

computationally efficient formulations based on one-step ADER formulations
 55 [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22] to extend the baseline 1D PCM scheme to mul-
 tiple spatial dimensions with high-order accuracy. The ADER methods have
 shown great promises in achieving high-order accurate solutions in multiple spa-
 tial dimensions using efficient temporal updating strategies for structured and
 unstructured grid geometries [19, 23], as well as for adaptive mesh refinement
 60 geometry [20]. As for the computational performance, the ADER schemes can
 yield about an order of magnitude improved time-to-solution performance rela-
 tive to the RK integration methods of the same solution accuracy [21]. Such a
 work will be considered in our future research to deliver high-order accuracy in
 designing the PCM scheme multidimensionally.

65 For a finite volume scheme in 1D we take the spatial average of Eq. (1) over
 the cell $I_i = [x_{i-1/2}, x_{i+1/2}]$, yielding a semi-discrete form,

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\Delta x}(\mathbf{F}_{i+1/2} - \mathbf{F}_{i-1/2}) \quad (3)$$

to get an equation for the evolution of the volume averaged variables, $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i =$
 $\frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{I_i} \mathbf{U}(x, t) dx$. Typically to achieve high-order accuracy in time the tempo-
 ral update is done using a TVD Runge-Kutta scheme in method-of-lines form
 70 [24, 14]. In this approach the high-order accuracy comes from taking the *multiple*
Euler stages of the RK time discretizations, which require repeated reconstruc-
 tions in a single time step, increasing the computational cost.

Instead, as will be fully described in Section 2, one of the novel ideas in PCM
 is to employ the simple *single stage* predictor-corrector type temporal update
 75 formulation in which we take the time-average of Eq. (3)

$$\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i^{n+1} = \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x}(\mathbf{F}_{i+1/2}^{n+1/2} - \mathbf{F}_{i-1/2}^{n+1/2}). \quad (4)$$

Here $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i^n = \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i(t^n)$ is the volume averaged quantity at t^n , and $\mathbf{F}_{i\pm 1/2}^{n+1/2} =$
 $\frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} \mathbf{F}_{i\pm 1/2}(t) dt$ is the time average of the interface flux from t^n to t^{n+1} .
 In this way high-order in space and time is accomplished with a single recon-
 struction in contrast to the multiple Euler stages of the RK time discretizations,
 80 providing significant benefits in computational efficiency per solution accuracy.

The organization of the paper is as follows: Section 2 describes the fifth-order accurate spatial reconstruction algorithm of PCM in 1D. We highlight several desirable properties of the PCM scheme in terms of computational efficiency and solution accuracy. Section 3 introduces the fourth-order accurate temporal
85 updating scheme of PCM using a predictor-corrector type characteristic tracing, which is much simpler than the typical high-order Runge-Kutta ODE updates. In Section 5 we discuss how we extend the 1D scheme in Section 2 to multiple spatial dimensions following the *dimension-by-dimension* [12, 13] approach to reconstruction, meaning that the PCM reconstruction uses one-dimensional re-
90 constructions in each normal direction, followed by evaluating 1D-based fluxes using a single-point quadrature rule at each cell face, followed by updating the system of multidimensional equations in Eq. (1) in a directionally unsplit fashion.

In Section 6 we test the PCM scheme on a wide spectrum of benchmark
95 problems in 1D, 2D and 3D, both for hydrodynamics and magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) applications. We also compare the PCM solutions with PPM and WENO solutions in order to examine numerical accuracy, capability and efficiency in both smooth and shock flow regimes. We conclude our paper in Section 7 with a brief summary.

100 **2. The One-Dimensional Piecewise Cubic Method (PCM) Spatial Reconstruction**

In this section we describe a new PCM scheme in a one-dimensional finite volume formulation for solving hyperbolic conservation laws of hydrodynamics and magnetohydrodynamics. The new PCM scheme is a higher-order extension
105 of Godunov’s method [25], bearing its key components in the reconstruction algorithm on the relevant ideas of its high-order predecessors, the PPM scheme [1], the WENO schemes [2, 26, 27, 28], and Hermite-WENO schemes [29, 30, 31, 32].

For the purpose of this section, we take the 3×3 hyperbolic system of

110 conservation laws of the 1D Euler equations

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial F(\mathbf{U})}{\partial x} = 0. \quad (5)$$

The notations used are the vector of the conservative variables $\mathbf{U}$ and fluxes $F(\mathbf{U})$, respectively, defined as

$$\mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho \\ \rho u \\ E \end{bmatrix}, \quad F(\mathbf{U}) = \begin{bmatrix} \rho u \\ \rho u^2 + p \\ u(E + p) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Here ρ is the fluid density, u is the fluid velocity in x -direction, and E is the total energy as the sum of the internal energy $\epsilon = p/(\gamma - 1)$ and the kinetic energy obeying the ideal gas law,

$$E = \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} + \frac{\rho u^2}{2}, \quad (7)$$

where p is the gas pressure, with the ratio of specific heats denoted as γ . We denote the cells in x -direction by $I_i = [x_{i-1/2}, x_{i+1/2}]$. We assume our grid is configured on an equidistant uniform grid for simplicity.

In addition to the system of the Euler equations in the conserved variables $\mathbf{U}$ as given in Eq. (5), we often use the two other equivalent system of equations each of which can be written either in the primitive variables $\mathbf{V} = [\rho, u, p]^T$ or in the characteristic variables $\mathbf{W}$. The characteristic variable $\mathbf{W}$ is readily obtained from $\mathbf{U}$ or $\mathbf{V}$ by multiplying the left eigenvectors corresponding to either $\mathbf{U}$ or $\mathbf{V}$, for instance, $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$. In the latter $\mathbf{L} (\equiv \mathbf{R}^{-1})$ represents the 3×3 matrix obtained from diagonalizing the coefficient matrix $\mathbf{A} = \partial \mathcal{F} / \partial \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{R}^{-1}$, whose rows are the k -th left eigenvectors $\ell^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, 3$. The representation of the system in $\mathbf{W}$ furnishes a completely linearly decoupled 1D system of equations,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{\Lambda} \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial x} = 0. \quad (8)$$

The above system in the characteristic variables $\mathbf{W}$ is therefore very handy for analyses, and also is a preferred choice of variable in order to furnish numerical solutions more accurate than third-order especially with better non-oscillatory

controls, in particular when considering wave-by-wave propagations in a system of equations [11]. For this reason the characteristic variable $\mathbf{W}$ is taken as our default variable choice in the 1D PCM reconstruction steps via characteristic
135 decompositions, albeit with an increased computational cost, among the other two choices of the primitive $\mathbf{V}$ or the conservative variables $\mathbf{U}$.

The methodology presented below can be similarly applied to the 1D ideal MHD equations (see for instance, [33]).

2.1. Piecewise Cubic Profile

140 To begin with we first define a cubic polynomial $p_i(x)$ to approximate a k -th characteristic variable $q \in \mathbf{W}$ on each interval I_i by

$$p_i(x) = c_0 + c_1(x - x_i) + c_2(x - x_i)^2 + c_3(x - x_i)^3. \quad (9)$$

The goal is now to determine the four coefficients c_i , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \leq i \leq 3$, which can be achieved by imposing the following four conditions:

$$\frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{I_i} p_i(x) dx = \bar{q}_i, \quad (10)$$

$$p_i(x_{i-1/2}) = q_{L,i}, \quad (11)$$

$$p_i(x_{i+1/2}) = q_{R,i}, \quad (12)$$

$$p'_i(x_i) = q'_{C,i}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\bar{q}_i = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{I_i} q(x, t^n) dx \quad (14)$$

145 is the cell-averaged quantity at t^n on I_i which is given as an initial condition;

$$q_{L,i} = q(x_{i-1/2}, t^n) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^p), \quad q_{R,i} = q(x_{i+1/2}, t^n) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^p) \quad (15)$$

are respectively the p -th order accurate pointwise left and the right Riemann states at t^n on the cell I_i that are unknown yet but are to be determined as described below; and lastly

$$q'_{C,i} = q'(x_i, t^n) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^r) \quad (16)$$

is the r -th order accurate approximation to the slope of q at t^n evaluated at x_i ,
 150 which is again unknown at this point but is to be determined as below.

For the moment let us assume that all four quantities $\bar{q}_i, q_{L,i}, q_{R,i}$ and $q'_{C,i}$ are known. It can be shown that the system of relations in Eqs. (10) $\sim$ (13) is equivalent to a system given as:

$$c_0 + c_2 \frac{\Delta x^2}{12} = \bar{q}_i, \quad (17)$$

$$c_0 - c_1 \frac{\Delta x}{2} + c_2 \frac{\Delta x^2}{4} - c_3 \frac{\Delta x^3}{8} = q_{L,i}, \quad (18)$$

$$c_0 + c_1 \frac{\Delta x}{2} + c_2 \frac{\Delta x^2}{4} + c_3 \frac{\Delta x^3}{8} = q_{R,i}, \quad (19)$$

$$c_1 = q'_{C,i}, \quad (20)$$

which, in turn, can be solved for all four $c_i, i = 1, \dots, 4$. The final expressions
 155 of the coefficients in terms of $\bar{q}_i, q_{L,i}, q_{R,i}$, and $q'_{C,i}$ are given as:

$$c_0 = \frac{1}{4} \left(-q_{R,i} - q_{L,i} + 6\bar{q}_i \right), \quad (21)$$

$$c_1 = q'_{C,i}, \quad (22)$$

$$c_2 = \frac{3}{\Delta x^2} \left(q_{R,i} + q_{L,i} - 2\bar{q}_i \right), \quad (23)$$

$$c_3 = \frac{4}{\Delta x^3} \left(q_{R,i} - q_{L,i} - \Delta x q'_{C,i} \right). \quad (24)$$

Therefore once we figure out the three unknowns, $q_{L,i}, q_{R,i}$, and $q'_{C,i}$, the cubic profile $p_i(x)$ in Eq. (9) can be completely determined and is ready to approximate q on each I_i .

We now devote the following sections to describe how to determine $q_{L,i}, q_{R,i}$,
 160 and $q'_{C,i}$ so that the resulting PCM approximation to the variable q lend its accuracy a fifth-order in space (Sections 2.2 and 2.3) and a fourth-order in time (Section 3).

2.2. Reconstruction of the Riemann States $q_{L,i}$ and $q_{R,i}$

We follow the fifth-order finite volume WENO approach, either of the classical WENO-JS [2], WENO-M [34], or WENO-Z [27, 28], in order to reconstruct
 165

the left and right Riemann states, $q_{L,i}$ and $q_{R,i}$, on each cell I_i ,

$$q_{L,R,i} = \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \omega_{\ell}^{\pm} p_{\ell}(x_{i\pm 1/2}). \quad (25)$$

where the explicit forms of p_{ℓ} are given in Appendix A. The nonlinear weights $\omega_{\ell}^{\pm}$ are determined by using one of the following schemes:

- For WENO-JS:

$$\omega_{\ell}^{\pm,JS} = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{\ell}^{\pm}}{\sum_s \tilde{\omega}_s^{\pm}}, \text{ where } \tilde{\omega}_{\ell}^{\pm} = \frac{\gamma_{\ell}^{\pm}}{(\epsilon + \beta_{\ell})^m} \quad (26)$$

170

- For WENO-M:

$$\omega_{\ell}^{\pm,M} = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{\ell}^{\pm}}{\sum_s \tilde{\omega}_s^{\pm}}, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\ell}^{\pm} = g_{\ell}(\omega_{\ell}^{\pm,JS}) = \frac{\omega_{\ell}^{\pm,JS} (\gamma_{\ell}^{\pm} + (\gamma_{\ell}^{\pm})^2 - 3(\gamma_{\ell}^{\pm})\omega_{\ell}^{\pm,JS} + (\omega_{\ell}^{\pm,JS})^2)}{(\gamma_{\ell}^{\pm})^2 + \omega_{\ell}^{\pm,JS}(1 - 2\gamma_{\ell}^{\pm})} \quad (28)$$

- For WENO-Z:

$$\omega_{\ell}^{\pm,Z} = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{\ell}^{\pm}}{\sum_s \tilde{\omega}_s^{\pm}}, \text{ where } \tilde{\omega}_{\ell}^{\pm} = \gamma_{\ell}^{\pm} \left(1 + \left(\frac{|\beta_0 - \beta_2|}{\epsilon + \beta_{\ell}} \right)^m \right) \quad (29)$$

175 In the above, the smoothness indicators β_{ℓ} are given by following the standard fifth order WENO reconstruction approach [11]. We also display their explicit forms in Appendix A.

In Eqs. (26), (27), and (29), ϵ is any arbitrarily small positive number that prevents division by zero, for which we choose $\epsilon = 10^{-36}$. One of the classical
180 choice of ϵ in many WENO literatures is found to be $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ [2, 26]; however, it was suggested in [34, 27] that ϵ should be chosen to be much smaller in order to force this parameter to play only its original role of avoiding division by zero in the definitions of the weights, Eqs. (26) and (29).

Another closely related point of discussion is with the value of m , the power
 185 in the denominators in Eqs. (26) and (29). The parameter m determines the
 rate of changes in β_ℓ , and most of the WENO literatures use $m = 2$. However,
 we observe that using $m = 1$ resolves discontinuities sharper in most of our
 numerical simulations without exhibiting any numerical instability, so became
 the default value in our implementation. For more detailed discussions on the
 190 choices of ϵ and m , see [34, 27, 28].

Using these nonlinear weights, we complete the WENO reconstruction pro-
 cedure of producing the fifth-order spatially accurate, non-oscillatorily recon-
 structed values at each cell interface at each time step t^n as defined in Eq.
 (25).

195 2.3. Reconstruction of the Derivative $q'_{C,i}$

The spatial reconstruction part of PCM proceeds to the next final step to
 obtain the derivative $q'_{C,i}$ in Eq. (13). The approach resembles with the $r = 4$
 WENO interpolation (i.e., pointwise) algorithm described in [3] in terms of
 using a set of third degree polynomials. The $r = 4$ WENO algorithm evaluates
 200 seventh order accurate cell interface values $q_{L;R,i}$ over a seven-point stencil using
 four third degree polynomials. In contrast, our approach is to reconstruct an
 approximation to a first derivative of a function $q'(x_i, t^n)$ [11] over a five-point
 stencil, using two third degree polynomials.

For this, we might consider using the same strategy in Section 2.2 in which
 205 the three second degree ENO polynomials in Eq. (25) are constructed over the
 five-point stencil $S = \cup_{\ell=1}^3 S_\ell$. However, this setup will provide only a third-
 order accurate approximation $q'_{C,i}$ to the exact derivative $q'(x_i)$. To see this, we
 first observe that the smoothness indicators β_ℓ with this setup will be including
 only a single term,

$$\beta_\ell = \Delta x^3 \int_{I_i} \left[p''_\ell(x) \right]^2 dx, \quad \ell = 1, 2, 3. \quad (30)$$

210 Through a Taylor expansion analysis on Eq. (30) we see

$$\beta_\ell = D(1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x)), \quad (31)$$

where $D = (q''\Delta x^2)^2$ is a nonzero quantity independent of ℓ but may depend on Δx , assuming $q'' \neq 0$ on S . This results in a set of three nonlinear weights ω_ℓ , $\ell = 1, 2, 3$, obtained either by Eq. (26) or Eq. (29), satisfying

$$\omega_\ell = \gamma_\ell + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x), \quad (32)$$

where the linear constant weights γ_ℓ are assumed to exist, when $q'(x, t^n)$ is
215 smooth in S , such that

$$q'_{C,i} = \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \gamma_\ell p'_\ell(x_i) = q'(x_i, t^n) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^3). \quad (33)$$

This finally implies the accuracy of $q'_{C,i}$ is found out to be third-order,

$$q'_{C,i} = \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \omega_\ell p'_\ell(x_i) = q'(x_i, t^n) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^3), \quad (34)$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \omega_\ell p'_\ell(x_i) - \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \gamma_\ell p'_\ell(x_i) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^3 (\omega_\ell - \gamma_\ell) (p'_\ell(x_i) - q'(x_i, t^n)) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \mathcal{O}(\Delta x) \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^2) = \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^3). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

In the last equality, we used the fact that, for each ℓ , $p'_\ell(x)$ is only a first degree polynomial which is accurate up to second-order when approximating $q'(x, t^n)$.

220 For this reason, we want a better strategy to obtain an approximation $q'_{C,i}$ at least fourth-order accurate in order that the overall nominal accuracy of the 1D PCM scheme achieves *at least* fourth-order accurate in both space and time.

Step 1: PPM-Build. An alternate strategy for this goal therefore would be to use a set of two third degree polynomials $\phi_\pm(x)$ over the same five-point
225 stencil $S = \cup_{\ell=1}^2 S_\ell$, where each polynomial is defined on $S_1 = \{I_{i-2}, \dots, I_{i+1}\}$ and $S_2 = \{I_{i-1}, \dots, I_{i+2}\}$. This can be designed using the two third degree polynomials, $\phi_\pm(x)$, from the PPM algorithm [1],

$$\phi_\pm(x) = \sum_{k=0}^3 a_k^\pm (x - x_{i\pm 1/2})^k, \quad (36)$$

where the coefficients are determined in such a way that $\phi_\pm$ preserves the volume average on each cell I_i . The explicit forms of $a_k^\pm$ are given in Appendix B.

230 *Step 2: Linear Constant Weights.* Now that the polynomials are determined over the stencil $S = \cup_{\ell=1}^2 S_\ell$, we use their first derivatives $\phi'_\pm$ to obtain a convex combination with two linear weights γ_- and γ_+ ,

$$q'_{C,i} = \gamma_- \phi'_-(x_i) + \gamma_+ \phi'_+(x_i). \quad (37)$$

The two linear weights are determined to obtain a fourth order accuracy in $q'_{C,i}$,

$$\gamma_- = \gamma_+ = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (38)$$

We display more details in Appendix B.

235 *Step 3: Nonlinear Weights.* The smoothness indicators $\beta_\pm$ are now constructed using $\phi_\pm(x)$ as

$$\beta_\pm = \sum_{s=2}^3 \left(\Delta x^{2s-1} \int_{I_i} \left[\frac{d^s}{dx^s} \phi_\pm(x) \right]^2 dx \right). \quad (39)$$

It is to be noted that the summation begins from $s = 2$ to measure their smoothness from the second derivative of $\phi_\pm(x)$ because $q'_{C,i}$ are our building blocks in this case. They can be written as

$$\beta_- = 4(a_2^-)^2 \Delta x^4 + 12(a_2^-)(a_3^-) \Delta x^5 + 48(a_3^-)^2 \Delta x^6 \quad (40)$$

240 and

$$\beta_+ = 4(a_2^+)^2 \Delta x^4 - 12(a_2^+)(a_3^+) \Delta x^5 + 48(a_3^+)^2 \Delta x^6. \quad (41)$$

Upon conducting Taylor series expansion analysis on $\beta_\pm$, we can see that

$$\beta_\pm = D(1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x)), \quad (42)$$

where $D = (q'' \Delta x^2)^2$ is a nonzero quantity independent of $\pm$ but might depend on Δx , assuming $q'' \neq 0$ on S . It is observed that unlike the smoothness indicators in Eqs. (A.8), the new two smoothness indicators in Eqs. (40) and 245 (41) are no longer written as a sum of perfect squares. Recently, Balsara et al. [35] reformulated the smoothness indicators as a sum of perfect squares for $r = 3$ to $r = 9$ finite difference WENO schemes. This compact form helps their new

finite difference adaptive WENO-AO schemes become computationally more efficient than the previous approach reported in [3].

250 The remaining procedure is to obtain the two nonlinear weights $\omega_{\pm}$ in the similar way done in the edge reconstructions in Eqs. (26) – (29):

- For WENO-JS:

$$\omega_{\pm}^{JS} = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{\pm}}{\tilde{\omega}_{-} + \tilde{\omega}_{+}}, \text{ where } \tilde{\omega}_{\pm} = \frac{\gamma_{\pm}}{(\epsilon + \beta_{\pm})^m} \quad (43)$$

- For WENO-M:

$$\omega_{\pm}^M = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{\pm}}{\tilde{\omega}_{-} + \tilde{\omega}_{+}}, \quad (44)$$

255 where

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\pm} = g(\omega_{\pm}^{JS}) = \frac{\omega_{\pm}^{JS} (\gamma_{\pm} + (\gamma_{\pm})^2 - 3(\gamma_{\pm})\omega_{\pm}^{JS} + (\omega_{\pm}^{JS})^2)}{(\gamma_{\pm})^2 + \omega_{\pm}^{JS}(1 - 2\gamma_{\pm})} \quad (45)$$

- For WENO-Z:

$$\omega_{\pm}^Z = \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{\pm}}{\tilde{\omega}_{-} + \tilde{\omega}_{+}}, \text{ where } \tilde{\omega}_{\pm} = \gamma_{\pm} \left(1 + \left(\frac{|\beta_{+} - \beta_{-}|}{\epsilon + \beta_{\pm}} \right)^m \right) \quad (46)$$

The final representation of the approximation $q'_{C,i}$ becomes

$$q'_{C,i} = \omega_{-}\phi'_{-}(x_i) + \omega_{+}\phi'_{+}(x_i). \quad (47)$$

Let us now verify that this approximation is fourth-order accurate after all, that
260 is,

$$q'_{C,i} = \omega_{-}\phi_{-}(x_i) + \omega_{+}\phi_{+}(x_i) = q'(x_i, t^n) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^4). \quad (48)$$

Similarly as before, using Eqs. (42), (43), and (46), we can see that, with the help of the binomial series expansion,

$$\omega_{\pm} = \gamma_{\pm} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x). \quad (49)$$

Therefore, the desired accuracy claimed in Eq. (48) is readily verified by repeating the similar relationship in Eq. (35):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=-,+} \omega_\ell \phi'_\ell(x_i) - \sum_{\ell=-,+} \gamma_\ell \phi'_\ell(x_i) &= \sum_{\ell=-,+} (\omega_\ell - \gamma_\ell) (\phi'_\ell(x_i) - q'(x_i, t^n)) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=-,+} \mathcal{O}(\Delta x) \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^3) = \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^4). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

265 Comparing Eq. (50) with Eq. (35), we now see that it is fourth-order accurate due to the improved third-order accuracy in calculating $\phi'_\ell(x_i) - q'(x_i, t^n)$. This is a result of using the third degree PPM polynomials $\phi_\pm(x)$, with which $q'(x, t^n)$ can be accurately approximated by the second degree polynomials $\phi'_\pm(x)$ up to third-order.

270 This completes the PCM spatial reconstruction steps that provide the fifth-order accurate Riemann states $q_{L;R,i}$, and the fourth-order accurate derivative $q'_{C,i}$ in space. The remaining task includes conducting a temporal updating step via tracing the characteristic lines using the piecewise cubic polynomials in Eq. (9). This step produces the Riemann states $(q_L, q_R) = (q_{R,i}^{n+1/2}, q_{L,i+1}^{n+1/2})$ as predictor. We will show in the next section that these predictors are at least 275 fourth-order accurate in time for 1D cases, and they are provided as the initial value problems for the Godunov fluxes at each interface $x_{i+1/2}$.

3. The PCM Characteristic Tracing for Temporal Updates

The PCM proceeds to the last step which advances the pointwise Riemann 280 interface states at t^n

$$q_{L;R,i} = p_i(x_{i\pm 1/2}), \quad (51)$$

where $p_i(x)$ is the piecewise cubic polynomial in Eq. (9), to the half-time updated predictor states

$$q_{L;R,i}^{n+1/2} \quad (52)$$

by tracing characteristics. The idea is same as how the PPM characteristic tracing is performed [1], in which we seek a time averaged state. For instance,

285 at the interface $x_{i+1/2}$, we consider

$$q_{x+1/2}^{n+1/2} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} q(x_{i+1/2}, t) dt. \quad (53)$$

The initial condition at t^n of a Generalized Riemann Problem (GRP) is given as

$$q(x_{i+1/2}, t^n) = \begin{cases} p_i(x_{i+1/2}), & x \in I_i \\ p_{i+1}(x_{i+1/2}), & x \in I_{i+1}. \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

Given a linear characteristic equation as in Eq. (8), and for $t > t^n$ we then have

$$q(x_{i+1/2}, t) = \begin{cases} p_i(x_{i+1/2} - \lambda_i(t - t^n)), & x \in I_i, \lambda_i > 0, \\ p_{i+1}(x_{i+1/2} - \lambda_{i+1}(t - t^n)), & x \in I_{i+1}, \lambda_{i+1} < 0. \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

Here $\xi(t) = x_{i+1/2} - \lambda(t - t^n)$ is a characteristic line for an eigenvalue λ , assuming
 290 $t - t^n < \Delta t$. In this approach we do not solve the Generalized Riemann Problem
directly. Rather we use a trapezium rule approximation in time to the integral
 in Eq. (53), where $q(x_{i+1/2}, t)$ the solution of the GRP along the t -axis at the
 interface $x_{i+1/2}$ in the t - x plane. Although this approach is very simple and
 can be considered to be very similar to the second order characteristic tracing
 295 algorithms of PLM and PPM [36, 1] we see there is a drawback in general. As
 it stands, the state $q(x_{i+1/2}, t)$ constructed using the linear characteristic line
 $\xi(t)$ in Eq. (55) is not fully justified in the cases of the Generalized Riemann
 problem where the characteristics are curved lines instead of straight lines in
 the x - t plane. On the other hand, it has been shown by Qian et al. [22] that
 300 a framework of high-order GRP methods can be formulated for second and
 third order accuracy by using a linear and quadratic GRP solvers respectively.
 Their approaches, relying on new treatments of resolving curved rarefaction and
 discontinuity waves, illustrate that the use of linear characteristics is not entirely
 supported in the third and higher order cases, especially for the system of cases.

305

Regardless, our simple characteristic tracing strategy has shown that a fast
 rate of convergence can be achieved for $\Delta t \sim \Delta x$, which is now described below
 for the case with $x \in I_i$ with $\lambda_i > 0$ first. Using $\uparrow$ to denote the state from the

left of $x_{i+1/2}$,

$$q_{R,i}^{n+1/2} = q_{x+1/2,\uparrow}^{n+1/2} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} q(x_{i+1/2}, t) dt \quad (56)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\lambda_i \Delta t} \int_{x_{i+1/2} - \lambda_i \Delta t}^{x_{i+1/2}} p_i(x) dx. \quad (57)$$

310 Again, as seen in Eqs. (56) and (57), the half-time advancement of the spatially reconstructed state is given by the average of the reconstructed variable $p_i(x)$ over the domain of dependence $[x_{i+1/2} - \lambda_i \Delta t, x_{i+1/2}]$ of the interface $x_{i+1/2}$. Therefore the accuracy of $q_{R,i}^{n+1/2}$ is inherited from that of the reconstruction algorithm of $p_i(x)$.

315 The outcome of the integration yields

$$\begin{aligned} q_{R,i}^{n+1/2} &= q_{x+1/2,\uparrow}^{n+1/2} \\ &= c_0 + \frac{c_1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_i \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right) \Delta x + \frac{c_2}{4} \left(1 - 2 \frac{\lambda_i \Delta t}{\Delta x} + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{\lambda_i \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)^2\right) \Delta x^2 \\ &+ \frac{c_3}{8} \left(1 - 3 \frac{\lambda_i \Delta t}{\Delta x} + 4 \left(\frac{\lambda_i \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)^2 - 2 \left(\frac{\lambda_i \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)^3\right) \Delta x^3. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

The case for $x \in I_{i+1}$ with $\lambda_{i+1} < 0$ can be obtained similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} q_{L,i+1}^{n+1/2} &= q_{x+1/2,\downarrow}^{n+1/2} \\ &= c_0 + \frac{c_1}{2} \left(-1 - \frac{\lambda_{i+1} \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right) \Delta x + \frac{c_2}{4} \left(1 + 2 \frac{\lambda_{i+1} \Delta t}{\Delta x} + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{\lambda_{i+1} \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)^2\right) \Delta x^2 \\ &+ \frac{c_3}{8} \left(-1 - 3 \frac{\lambda_{i+1} \Delta t}{\Delta x} - 4 \left(\frac{\lambda_{i+1} \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)^2 - 2 \left(\frac{\lambda_{i+1} \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)^3\right) \Delta x^3. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

In the general case of a system of Euler equations, the above treatment is to be extended to include multiple characteristic waves correspondingly depending on the sign of each k -th eigenvalue $\lambda_i^{(k)}$. This gives us, for the two predictor

320 states $\mathbf{V}_{L;R,i}^{n+1/2}$ on each cell I_i in primitive form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_{R,i}^{n+1/2} &= \mathbf{C}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k; \lambda_i^{(k)} > 0} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right) r^{(k)} \Delta \mathbf{C}_1^{(k)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k; \lambda_i^{(k)} > 0} \left(1 - 2 \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x}\right)^2\right) r^{(k)} \Delta \mathbf{C}_2^{(k)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{8} \sum_{k; \lambda_i^{(k)} > 0} \left(1 - 3 \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} + 4 \left(\frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right)^2 - 2 \left(\frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right)^3 \right) r^{(k)} \Delta \mathbf{C}_3^{(k)}, \quad (60)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_{L,i}^{n+1/2} &= \mathbf{C}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k; \lambda_i^{(k)} < 0} \left(-1 - \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right) r^{(k)} \Delta \mathbf{C}_1^{(k)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k; \lambda_i^{(k)} < 0} \left(1 + 2 \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right)^2 \right) r^{(k)} \Delta \mathbf{C}_2^{(k)}, \\ &+ \frac{1}{8} \sum_{k; \lambda_i^{(k)} < 0} \left(-1 - 3 \frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} - 4 \left(\frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right)^2 - 2 \left(\frac{\lambda_i^{(k)} \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right)^3 \right) r^{(k)} \Delta \mathbf{C}_3^{(k)}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Those new notations introduced in Eqs. (60) and (61) represent the k -th right eigenvector $r^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, 3$, which is the k -th column vector of the 3×3 matrix $\mathbf{R}$ evaluated at I_i ,

$$\mathbf{R} = \left[r^{(1)} | r^{(2)} | r^{(3)} \right], \quad (62)$$

325 and the k -th characteristic variable vector $\Delta \mathbf{C}_m^{(k)}$ given as

$$\Delta \mathbf{C}_m^{(k)} = \Delta x^m \ell^{(k)} \cdot \mathbf{C}_m, \quad (63)$$

where, for $m = 0, \dots, 3$,

$$\mathbf{C}_m = \left[c_m^{(1)} | c_m^{(2)} | c_m^{(3)} \right]^T, \quad (64)$$

in which $c_m^{(k)}$ is the m -th coefficient in Eqs. (21) $\sim$ (24) of the piecewise cubic polynomial in Eq. (9) applied to each of the k -th characteristic variable $\bar{q}_i$.

It is worth mentioning that, unlike the characteristic tracing of PPM (see
330 [1]), the PCM scheme does not necessarily require any extra monotonicity en-
forcements on $\mathbf{V}_{L,R,i}^{n+1/2}$. This is mainly because the PCM reconstruction makes
full use of the WENO reconstruction algorithms, providing non-oscillatory ap-
proximations to $q_{L,R,i}$ and $q'_{C,i}$ by design.

4. Final Update Step in 1D

335 We now update $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i^n$ to $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i^{n+1}$ using the high-order Godunov fluxes $\mathbf{F}_{i+1/2}^{n+1/2} = \mathcal{RP}(\mathbf{U}_L, \mathbf{U}_R) = \mathcal{RP}(\mathbf{U}_{R,i}^{n+1/2}, \mathbf{U}_{L,i+1}^{n+1/2})$ as corrector, where $\mathcal{RP}$ implies a solution of the Riemann problem. Note that the Riemann states in conservative variables $\mathbf{U}_{R,i}^{n+1/2}, \mathbf{U}_{L,i+1}^{n+1/2}$ are obtained either by conversions from $\mathbf{V}_{R,i}^{n+1/2}, \mathbf{V}_{L,i+1}^{n+1/2}$ in Eq. (60) and Eq. (61), or projecting the characteristic variables directly to the conservative variables in Eq. (60) and Eq. (61). We note that the first
340 needs to be processed using high-order approximation [14], in particular for multidimensional problems, while such a high-order conversion is not required in 1D. In this regards the latter could be a better choice in multi spatial dimensions, because there is no need for any high-order conversion from the primitive
345 Riemann states to the conservative Riemann states, knowing the fact that the *conservative* states variables are the type of inputs for the Riemann problems.

5. Multidimensional Extension of the 1D PCM Scheme

Our primary purpose in the current paper is to focus on laying down the key algorithmic components of PCM in 1D. As described, the 1D PCM algorithm
350 is formally fifth-order in space and fourth-order in time. Our test problems of one-dimensional smooth flows in Section 6.1.1 show that the algorithm delivers nominally a fifth-order accurate convergence rate, particularly with smaller L_1 errors than WENO-JS with RK4.

Although possible, extending such a high-order 1D algorithm to multiple
355 spatial dimensions in a way to preserve the same order of convergence in 1D is an attentive task that requires some extra cares and attentions [11, 12, 13, 14] in the finite volume formulation. On the other hand, one of the simplest and easiest directionally unsplit multidimensional extensions that has been widely adopted in many algorithmic choices [37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47] is
360 to use the so-called *dimension-by-dimension* formalism [12]. In this approach, a finite volume scheme adopts a 1D reconstruction procedure to obtain high order accurate edge values at cell faces, use them to approximate fluxes at a

single barycentric point on each cell face, and update the conserved variables using those fluxes in a directionally unsplit way. However, the order of convergence from the resulting multidimensional extension is limited to be at most second-order due to the lack of accuracies that may arise in a couple of places in code implementations: (i) mis-using averaged quantities in place of pointwise quantities for Riemann states, (ii) using low-order approximations in converting between primitive and conservative variables, (iii) and applying low-order quadrature rules in flux function estimations [11, 12, 13, 14]. In our case, it takes more coding efforts, practically because the multidimensional PCM results we demonstrate in this paper have been obtained by integrating the PCM algorithm in the FLASH code framework [41, 42, 48]; hence carrying out the above-mentioned code changes in a large code such as FLASH requires extra efforts that are not the main points of the current paper. We leave such a high-order, multidimensional extension in our future work, and instead, we adopt the simple dimension-by-dimension formalism for our multidimensional extension of the 1D PCM algorithm.

Additionally, for our choice of multidimensional extension we use the computationally efficient unsplit corner transport upwind (CTU) formulation in FLASH [43, 44], which requires smaller number of Riemann solves in both 2D and 3D than the conventional CTU approaches [49, 50, 51], while achieving the maximum Courant condition of $CFL \approx 1$ [43, 44].

6. Results

In this section we present numerical results of PCM in 1D, 2D and 3D for hydrodynamics and magnetohydrodynamics. The PCM results are compared with numerical solutions of other popular choices of reconstruction schemes including the second-order PLM [36], the third-order PPM [1] and the fifth-order WENO methods [2, 27, 28]. As mentioned, the second-order accurate dimension-by-dimension approach has been adopted to extend all of the above baseline 1D reconstruction algorithms to multiple spatial dimensions. As this is

the case, for multidimensional problems we have chosen the predictor-corrector type of characteristic tracing methods (charTr) for PLM, PPM, and WENO[†], not to mention PCM by design. In 1D problems, however, we treat WENO differently and integrate its spatial reconstruction with RK4 in consideration of fully demonstrating its orders of accuracy due from both space (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(\Delta x^5)$) and time (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^4)$). It should also be noted that the orders of WENO + RK4 in 1D are to be well comparable to those of PCM. Hence the choice provides a set of good informative comparisons between PCM and WENO + RK4 in particular, in which we will illuminate the advantages of PCM. In what follows, unless otherwise mentioned, we set the WENO-JS approach in Eq. (43) as the default choice for $q'_{C,i}$ in our PCM results. This default setting will be referred to as *PCM-JS* (or simply *PCM*), while the choice with the WENO-Z approach in Eq. (46) will be referred to as *PCM-Z*.

6.1. 1D Tests

6.1.1. 1D Convergence and Performance Tests

Gaussian and Sinusoidal Wave Advections. In our first test we consider two configurations of 1D passive advection of smooth flows, involving initial density profiles of Gaussian and sinusoidal waves. We initialize the both problems on a computational box on $[0,1]$ with periodic boundary conditions. The initial density profile of the Gaussian advection is defined by $\rho(x) = 1 + e^{-100(x-x_0)^2}$, with $x_0 = 0.5$, whereas for the sinusoidal advection the density is initialized by $\rho(x) = 1.5 - 0.5 \sin(2\pi x)$. In both cases, we set constant velocity, $u = 1$, and pressure, $P = 1/\gamma$, and the specific heat ratio, $\gamma = 5/3$.

The resulting profiles are propagated for one period through the boundaries, reaching $t = 1$. At this point, both profiles return to its initial positions at which we conduct the L_1 error convergence tests compared with the initial conditions

[†]To implement a characteristic tracing for WENO we first reconstruct the fifth-order Riemann states, $q_{S,i}^{weno,n}$, $S = L, R$, using WENO. They are then temporally evolved by $\Delta t/2$ to get $q_{S,i}^{weno,n+1/2}$ by integrating over each corresponding domain of dependence the piecewise parabolic polynomials defined by $q_{L,i}^{weno,n}$, $q_{R,i}^{weno,n}$ and $\bar{q}_i$ [48].

Figure 1: Convergence test of (a) 1D Gaussian pulse advection, and (b) 1D sinusoidal wave advection.

on the grid resolutions of $N_x = 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512$ and 1024 . Since the nature of the problem is a pure advection in both, any deformation of the initial profile is due to either phase errors or numerical diffusion. For stability we use a fixed Courant number, $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$ for both tests. We choose the HLLC Riemann solver [52] in all cases.

The results of this study are shown in Fig. 1. From these numerical experiments, the PCM reconstruction shows the fifth-order convergence rates in both tests. Although both PCM and WENO-JS + RK4 demonstrate the same fifth-order of convergence rate, the L_1 errors of PCM are more than twice smaller than those of WENO-JS + RK4. The solutions of PPM converge with the rate of 2.5 which is the slowest among the three. Parameter choices for the PPM runs include the use of the MC slope limiter applied to characteristic variables, no flattening, no contact discontinuity steepening, and no artificial viscosity (this setting for PPM remains the same in what follows).

In Table 1 we compare the relative performance speedups of PCM, PPM and WENO-JS + RK4, all testing the Gaussian and sinusoidal advection problems. We can clearly see that there is a big performance advantage in PCM over WENO-JS + RK4 in delivering the target fifth-order accuracy. The major

Scheme	Speedup
PPM	0.65
PCM	1.00
WENO-JS + RK4	1.71

Table 1: Relative speedup of the PPM and WENO schemes compared to the PCM scheme for the 1D Gaussian and sine advection problems. The comparisons have been obtained from a serial calculation on a single CPU.

gain in PCM lies in its predictor-corrector type of characteristic tracing which affords not only the accuracy but also the computational efficiency. Such a relative computational efficiency of PCM in 1D is expected to grow much larger in multidimensional problems, considering that there have to be added algorithmic complexities in achieving high-order accurate solutions in multidimensional
440 finite volume reconstruction [11, 12, 13, 14] from the perspectives of balancing optimal numerical stability and accuracy. We will report our strategies of multidimensional extension of PCM in our future work.

6.1.2. 1D Discontinuous Tests

445 In this section we test PCM on a series of well-benchmarked shock-tube problems of one dimensional hydrodynamics and MHD that involve discontinuities and shocks. As all the tests here have already been well discussed in various literatures, we will describe their setups only briefly and put our emphasis more on discussing the code performance of PCM. Readers are encouraged to refer to
450 the cited references in the texts for more detailed descriptions on each setup.

(a) Sod Shock Tube. The Sod’s problem [53] has been one of the most widely chosen popular tests in 1D to assess a code’s capability to handle shocks and contact discontinuities. The initial condition is consist of the left and the right states given as

$$(\rho, u, p) = \begin{cases} (1, 0, 1) & x < 0.5, \\ (0.125, 0, 0.1) & x > 0.5, \end{cases} \quad (65)$$

Figure 2: The Sod shock tube problem at $t = 0.2$. (a) PCM, (b) PPM with MC slope limiter, and (c) WENO-JS + RK4.

455 with the ratio of specific heats $\gamma = 1.4$ on the entire domain $[0, 1]$. The outflow
boundary conditions are imposed at $x = 0$ and $x = 1$. Shown in Fig. 2
include numerical solutions of PCM, PPM and WENO-JS + RK4. The Roe
Riemann solver [54] was used in all cases. The test cases (denoted in symbols)
are resolved on the grid size of $N_x = 128$, and are compared with the reference
460 solutions (denoted in solid curves) computed using WENO-JS + RK4 on the
grid resolution of $N_x = 1024$. A fixed value of $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$ was used for all tests.

The result in Fig. 2(a) shows that the solutions of PCM well predict all
nonlinear flow characteristics of the rarefaction wave, the contact discontinuity,
and the shock. A notable thing in PCM is the number of points at the shock.
465 We see in Fig. 2(a) that at the shock there is only one single point in all flow
variables, whereas in all other cases, there are two points spread over the shock
width.

(b) The Shu-Osher Test. The second test is the Shu-Osher problem [55]. In this
problem we test PCM's ability to resolve both small-scale smooth flow features
470 and the shock. On $[-4.5, 4.5]$, the initial condition launches a nominally Mach
3 shock wave at $x = -4.0$ propagating into a region ($x > -4.0$) of a constant
density field with sinusoidal perturbations. As the shock advances, two sets of
density features appear behind the shock. The first set has the same spatial
frequency as the un-shocked perturbations, whereas and the second set behind
475 the shock involves the frequency that is doubled. The important point of the
test is to see how well a code can accurately resolve strengths of the oscillations
behind the shock, as well as the shock itself.

The results of this test are shown for PLM, PPM, WENO-JS + RK4, and
PCM in Fig. 3. The solutions are calculated at $t = 1.8$ using a resolution of
480 $N_x = 256$ and are compared to a reference solution resolved on $N_x = 1024$.
All methods were solved using the Roe Riemann solver, with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$. It is
evident in Fig. 3(b) that the PCM solution exhibits the least diffusive solution
among the tested methods, producing a very-high order accurate solution that
is more quickly approaching to the high resolution reference solution.

(a)

(b)

Figure 3: The Shu-Osher Riemann problem at $t = 1.8$. (a) All four reconstruction schemes on $N_x = 256$ are compared with WENO-JS + RK4 on $N_x = 1024$. For PPM, the MC slope limiter is used. (b) A close-up view to demonstrate the schemes' numerical diffusivity.

Figure 4: The Einfeldt strong rarefaction test at $t = 0.15$. All tests used the HLLC Riemann solver on $N_x = 128$ with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$. The solid curves represent the reference solution computed using WENO-JS + RK4 on $N_x = 1024$.

485 (c) *The Einfeldt Strong Rarefaction Test*. First described by Einfeldt et al. [56]
the main test point in this problem is to see how satisfactorily a code can
compute physical variables, p, u, ρ, ϵ , etc. in the low density region. Among the
variables the internal energy $\epsilon = p/(\rho(\gamma - 1))$, where $\gamma = 1.4$, is the hardest to
get it right due to the ratio of the pressure and density that are both close to
490 zero. The ratio of the two small quantities will amplify any small errors in each,
hence making the error in ϵ appear to be the largest in general [10].

The large errors in ϵ are indeed observed in Fig. 4(b) $\sim$ Fig. 4(c) in that the
error is the largest at or around $x = 0.5$ in the presence of sudden increase of its
peak values. On the contrary, the internal energy computed using PCM shown

495 in Fig. 4(a) behaves in a uniquely different way such that the value continues to drop when approaching $x = 0.5$. From this viewpoint, and with the help of the exact solution available in [10], it's fair to say that the PCM solution in Fig. 4(a) appears to predict the internal energy most accurately.

(d) Two-Blast. This problem was introduced by Woodward and Colella [57] and was designed to test a code performance particularly on interactions of strong shocks and discontinuities. We follow the original setup to test PCM, and compare its solution with those of PPM and WENO-JS + RK4, using 128 grid points to resolve the domain $[0, 1]$. In Fig. 5 the three density profiles at $t = 0.038$ are plotted against the high-resolution solution of WENO-JS + RK4 on 1024 grid points. Overall, all methods we tested here produce an acceptable quality of solutions as illustrated in Fig. 5(a). Note however that, among the three methods, the PCM solution in Fig. 5(b) demonstrates the highest peak heights, following more closely the high-resolution solutions. As reported in [40] we see that all methods also smear out the contact discontinuity at $x \approx 0.6$ pretty much the same amount.

(e) Brio-Wu MHD Shock Tube. An MHD version of the Sod's shock tube problem was first studied by Brio and Wu [33], and it has become a must-to-do test for MHD codes. Since then, the problem has revealed a couple of interesting findings including not only the discovery of the compound wave [33], but also the existence of non-unique solutions [58, 59]. More recently, Lee [60] realized that there are unphysical numerical oscillations in using PPM and studied an approach to suppress the level of oscillations based on the upwind slope limiter. The presence of such oscillations in PPM has been also briefly reported in [40]. The study reported in [60] shows that the origin of the oscillations arise from the numerical nature of a slowly moving shock as a function of the magnetic strength of tangential component. The slowly moving shock was first identified in [57], and the oscillatory behaviors have been studied by many researchers for more than 30 years, yet there is no ultimate resolution [61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66].

Figure 5: Two blast problem at $t = 0.038$. (a) All three reconstruction schemes on $N_x = 128$ are compared with WENO-JS + RK4 on $N_x = 1024$. For PPM, the MC slope limiter is used. (b) A close-up view to demonstrate the schemes' numerical accuracy. In all tests we used the HLLC Riemann solver with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$.

Figure 6: The Brio-Wu MHD shock tube problem. The Roe Riemann solver is consistently used for all methods. The test problems are computed on $N_x = 128$, while the high-resolution reference solution is obtained using PLM on $N_x = 2048$ with the MC slope limiter. The same slope limiter was used in PPM too. The Courant number is fixed as 0.8 in all runs.

In this test, as just mentioned, there are observable numerical oscillations
 525 found in all methods, PPM, PCM and WENO-JS + charTr. The results in Fig.
 6 show that the oscillations are the largest in PPM, consistent with the findings
 in [60], and there are less amount in PCM and WENO-JS + charTr. The PPM
 solutions are suffering from significant amount of spurious oscillations in all
 four variables, ρ, u, p and B_y , as shown in Fig. 6(b). Such behaviors are less
 530 significant in PCM and WENO-JS + charTr, respectively illustrated in Fig. 6(a)
 and Fig. 6(c), in that, the oscillations in ρ, p, B_y are much more controlled now,
 while the most outstanding oscillations are found in u near $x \approx 0.8$. It is worth

mentioning that the oscillatory behaviors remain to be consistent regardless of the choice of Riemann solvers such as HLL [67], HLLC [68], HLLD [69], or Roe [54] (tested here).

Figure 7: The RJ2a MHD shock tube problem. All runs used the HLLD Riemann solver, computed on $N_x = 128$ with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$. The reference solution was obtained using PLM on $N_x = 2048$. The PLM and PPM methods used the MC slope limiter.

(f) *RJ2a MHD Shock Tube*. Ryu et al. [70] studied a class of one dimensional MHD shock tube problems that are informative to run as a code verification test. We have chosen one of their setups, introduced in their figure 2a. In what follows the problem is referred to be as the RJ2a test. The viewpoint of this test is to monitor if all three dimensional MHD waves are successfully captured. We see that in Fig. 7 all structures of left- and right-going fast shocks, left- and right-going slow shocks, and a contact discontinuity are well captured in all

Figure 8: Convergence test of the 2D isentropic hydrodynamical vortex advection problem. The errors in ρ , u , and v are calculated in L_1 sense against the initial conditions. The tested PCM solutions are solved on $N_x \times N_y$, where $N_x = N_y = 32, 64, 128, 256$ and 512 . All runs reached to $t = 10$ using the HLLC Riemann solver with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$.

methods tested, including PCM.

6.2. 2D Tests

545 We present two dimensional tests of hydrodynamics and MHD in this section. All test cases are computed using the second-order dimension-by-dimension extension of the baseline 1D algorithms, including PCM.

6.2.1. 2D Convergence Test of the Isentropic Vortex Advection – Hydro case

550 The first 2D test problem, considered in [71, 3], consists of the advection of an isentropic vortex along the diagonal of a cartesian computational box. The dynamics of the problem allows to quantify a code’s dissipative properties and the correct discretization balance of multidimensional terms through monitoring the preservation of the initial circular shape of the vortex. At $t = 10$ the vortex finishes one periodic advection over the domain and returns to the initial position, where we can measure the solution accuracy against the initial condition. 555 As such we have chosen this problem particularly to access the PCM’s order of

Figure 9: Convergence test of the 2D isentropic MHD vortex advection problem. The errors in ρ, u, v, B_x, B_y and the magnetic pressure B_p are calculated in L_1 sense against the initial conditions. The tested PCM solutions are solved on $N_x \times N_y$, where $N_x = N_y = 32, 64, 128, 256$ and 512. All runs reached to $t = 10$ using the HLLC Riemann solver with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$.

convergence rate in 2D. We omit the details of the initial problem setup which can be found in [71, 3].

As expected, the results presented in Fig. 8 clearly confirm that, when PCM is extended to 2D using the simple dimension-by-dimension formulation, the overall numerical solution accuracy converges in second-order, regardless of its inherent fifth-order property in 1D.

6.2.2. 2D Convergence Test of the Isentropic Vortex Advection – MHD case

We also ran an MHD 2D isentropic vortex test which is an analogous MHD version of the previous hydro vortex test, in order to demonstrate PCM's convergence rate on the magnetic fields as well. The test was presented by Balsara [72] and we omit the details of the setup for brevity. As expected, the results presented in Fig. 9 clearly confirm that, PCM demonstrate second order accuracy in two dimensional magnetic field evolutions.

570 *6.2.3. 2D Discontinuous Tests*

(a) Sedov. We consider the Sedov blast test [73] to check PCM's ability to handle a spherical symmetry of the strong hydrodynamical shock explosion. The problem studies a self-similar evolution of a spherical shock wave propagation due to an initial point-source of a highly pressurized perturbation. The test has
575 been used widely in various literatures, and we follow the same setup found in [41]. Panels in Fig. 10 show the density field in linear scale at $t = 0.05$ resolved on a grid size of 256×256 for the domain $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. The HLLC Riemann solver was used in all runs with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$. The range of the plotted densities in colors in all four panels is $0.01 \leq \rho \leq 4.9$, the same is also used for the 30
580 levels of density contour lines that are plotted in logarithmic scale.

As can be seen, the PCM solution in Fig. 10(a) is superior not only in preserving a great deal of the spherical symmetry at the outermost shock front, but also in revealing more flow structures in the central low density region, again in the most spherical manner. This great ability of preserving the spherical
585 symmetry in PCM is also found in Fig. 11(a) where the two curves are the two section cuts of density fields along $y = 0.5$ (black) and $y = x$ (cyan), respectively. We see that the two peak values of each section cut are matching each other very closely in terms of both their locations and their magnitudes. In the other schemes there are clearly much larger disagreements in the magnitude of the
590 peak density values. Balsara and his collaborators [74, 75] also have shown that the use of multidimensional Riemann solvers provide an excellent capability of preserving isentropic propagation of the blast wave as well.

(b) 2D Riemann Problems. Next we test PCM for a family of well-known benchmarked Riemann problems whose mathematical classification was originally put
595 forward by Zhang and Zheng [76], in which the original 16 of admissible configurations were conjectured on polytropic gas. This claim was corrected by Schultz-Rinne [77] that one of them was impossible, and the numerical testings for such 15 configurations were studied in [78]. Later, Lax and Liu showed that there are total of 19 genuinely different configurations available, providing nu-

Figure 10: The Sedov explosion test. (a) PCM, (b) PPM, and (c) WENO-JS + charTr. All calculations are done on 256×256 cells with the HLLC Riemann solver and with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$. PPM is computed using the MC slope limiter. 30 equally spaced levels of density contour lines are shown in logarithmic scale.

merical solutions of all 19 cases too [79]. See also [80]. Until today, this family
of 2D Riemann problems has been chosen by many people to demonstrate that
their numerical algorithms can predict these 19 configurations successfully in
pursuance of code verification purposes [12, 81, 82, 83]. We follow the setup
as described in [82] in the following two verification tests, Configuration 3 and
Configuration 5. In both cases the calculations show numerical solutions on

Figure 11: Two section cuts of ρ from the Sedov test in Fig. 10. The two lines represent section cuts of densities along $y = 0.5$ (black curves) and $y = x$ (cyan curves). (a) PCM, (b) PPM, and (c) WENO-JS + charTr.

$[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ using outflow boundary conditions.

(b) – *Configuration 3*. Panels in Fig. 12 show numerical solutions of density at $t = 0.8$ resolved on 400×400 using the HLLC Riemann solvers with $C_{\text{cfl}} = 0.8$. Also shown are the 40 contour lines of ρ . The range of ρ is fixed as $0.1 \leq \rho \leq 1.8$ in both the pseudo-color figures and the contour lines. For the PCM method we employed both approaches of WENO-JS (see Eq. (43)) and WENO-Z (see

Figure 12: 2D Riemann Problem – Configuration 3. (a) PLM, (b) PPM, (c) WENO-JS + CharTr, (d) WENO-Z + CharTr, (e) PCM-JS, and (f) PCM-Z. Each panel shows the density values at $t = 0.8$ between $[0.1, 1.8]$ in linear scale, calculated using 400×400 grid cells. The total of 40 contour lines are over-plotted. The MC slope limiter is used in (a) and (b).

Eq. (46)) for the calculations of the smoothness stencils. The figures can be directly compared with Fig. 6 in [82] where they used the same grid resolution for their hybrid compact-WENO scheme. First of all, including the two PCM
615 solutions, we see that all calculations have produced their solutions successfully, in particular, without suffering unphysical oscillations near shocks and contact discontinuities. This test confirms that the PCM results are well comparable to the other solutions, except for some expected minor discrepancies.

One thing to notice is that the PPM solution in Fig. 12(b) has interestingly
620 much more formations of Kelvin-Helmholtz instabilities, identified as vortical rollups along the slip lines (shown as the interface boundaries between the green triangular regions and the sky blue areas surrounding the mushroom-shaped jet). This feature is also often found in a test known as “Double Mach reflection” [57], where the similar pattern of rollups are detected along the slip line. As
625 found in various studies [13, 30, 37] it is conventional to say that the amount of such vortical rollups at slip lines is one of the key factors to measure inherent numerical dissipations in a code. If we follow this approach, it then leads us to say that the PPM method is the least dissipative method among the six methods we tested. However, we find that this conclusion is somewhat arguable
630 considering the nominal order of accuracy of PPM is lower than those of WENO-JS + CharTr, WENO-Z + CharTr and PCM. We think that there is to be more accurate assessment regarding this type of conclusion. Readers can find a very similar numerical comparison between PPM and WENO-JS in [37].

(b) – Configuration 5. As a second 2D Riemann problem we consider Configura-
635 tion 5 to test PCM and compare its solution with three other solutions of PLM, PPM and WENO-JS + CharTr. The WENO-JS approaches in Eqs. (26) and (43) are adopted for PCM for the calculations of the smoothness stencils. The choice of grid resolution is 1024×1024 in this test in order to directly compare our results with the results reported in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 of [12]. As obtained
640 in Fig. 13, the PCM solution satisfactorily compares well with the solutions of PPM and WENO-JS + CharTr, as well as with the high-resolution results

Figure 13: 2D Riemann Problem – Configuration 5. (a) PLM, (b) PPM, (c) WENO-JS + CharTr., and (d) PCM-JS. Each panel shows the density values at $t = 0.23$ between $[0.69, 4.2]$ in linear scale, resolved on 1024×1024 grid cells. The total of 40 contour lines are over-plotted. The MC slope limiter is used in (a) and (b). All runs used the Roe Riemann solver with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$.

in [12]. As also reported in [12, 13], when considering discontinuous flows in multiple space dimensions, the dimension-by-dimension approach works just as fine in terms of producing comparably accurate solutions. Likewise, the results in Fig. 13 show that we observe the same qualitative performances in all the methods we tested here, including PCM.

Although all the solutions are comparably admissible, there are few distinctive features in the PCM solution, displayed in Fig. 13 (d). We note that the minimum and maximum values of the computed density are respectively the smallest and the largest among the four results. This trend is consistent with the increasing order of accuracy in the four panels here. The same observation can be found also in Fig. 12 too. We consider this as an indication that the small scale features are better resolved in PCM with less amount of numerical diffusion.

(c) MHD Rotor. Next, we consider the MHD rotor problem [84, 85]. As the problem has been discussed by various people we rather focus on discussing the solution of PCM here. We use the same setup conditions as described in [43]. Exhibited in Fig. 14(e) and Fig. 14(f) are respectively the density and the 30 contour lines of the Mach number on 400×400 cells, both at $t = 0.15$. With minor discrepancies, we see that the PCM solution successfully demonstrates its ability to solve MHD flows in multiple space dimensions. To test PCM for multidimensional MHD flows, we integrated the PCM algorithm in the MHD scheme [43, 44] of the FLASH code [41, 42, 48]. Of noteworthy point is that the contour lines of the Mach number in Fig. 14(f) remain concentric in the central region without any distortion from the near-perfect symmetry. In all runs the HLLD Riemann solver [69] was used with a fixed value $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$. The PPM run used the MC slope limiter for monotonicity.

6.3. 3D Tests

Lastly, for 3D cases, we have selected three test problems in MHD in such a way that we can fully quantify the performance of PCM both for assessing

Figure 14: 2D MHD Rotor problem. The panels on the left column show the density at $t = 0.15$, and the panels on the right show the 30 contour lines of the Mach number at the same time. (a) ρ using PPM, (b) Mach number using PPM, (c) ρ using WENO-JS + CharTr, (d) Mach number using WENO-JS + CharTr, (e) ρ using PCM, and (f) Mach number using PCM.

its convergence rate in 3D and for verifying its code capability in discontinuous flows.

6.3.1. 3D Convergence Test

Alfvén Wave Convergence Test – UG. We solve the circularly polarized Alfvén Wave propagation problem [44, 50] as our first 3D test problem to quantify the PCM’s order of accuracy in full 3D. The computational domain is resolved on $2N_x \times N_y \times N_z$ grid cells, where we choose $N_x = N_y = N_z = 8, 16, 32$ and 64 for the grid convergence study. As in [44] we ran the same two configurations of the wave mode that are the standing wave mode and the traveling wave mode until $t = 1$. In both we choose the Roe Riemann solver with $C_{\text{cfl}} = 0.95$.

Respectively, Fig. 15(a) and Fig. 15(b) are the L_1 numerical errors on a logarithmic scale for the standing wave case and the traveling wave case. We observe that the rate of PCM convergence in 3D is second-order as expected, which agrees with the results reported in [44]. One difference is noted in the standing wave case in Fig. 15(a) that PCM’s L_1 error in each grid resolution is much lower than those obtained with PPM + HLLD + F-CTU with $C_{\text{cfl}} = 0.95$ in [44]. However, the magnitudes of the PCM error in the traveling wave case in Fig. 15(b) look pretty much similar to the equivalent run in [44].

Figure 15: The circularly polarized Alfvén wave convergence rate for both the standing and traveling wave problems using PCM combined with the Roe Riemann solver.

6.3.2. 3D Discontinuous Tests

Figure 16: The 3D MHD blast problem. All results used the PCM scheme with the hybrid Riemann solver using $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$. (a) $B_x = 0$, (b) $B_x = \frac{50}{\sqrt{4\pi}}$, and (c) $B_x = \frac{100}{\sqrt{4\pi}}$. In each panel, we show four different plasma quantities, gas pressure in the top right quadrant, density in top left, total velocity in bottom left, and magnetic pressure in bottom right. Each corresponding color bar is shown immediately next to the corresponding quantity.

690 *(a) 3D MHD Blast – UG.* We consider the 3D variant of the MHD blast problem by adopting the setup conditions in [44] to demonstrate the three-dimensional propagation of strong MHD shocks using the PCM algorithm. The original 2D version of the spherical blast wave problem was studied in [86], and later various

people adopted the similar setup conditions [40, 43, 44, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91,
695 92, 93] for their code verifications in strongly magnetized shock flows.

We display four different fluid variables in each panel in Fig. 16. From the
top right quadrant to the bottom right quadrant in counter clockwise direction,
we show the gas pressure p , the density ρ , the total velocity $U = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2 + w^2}$,
and the magnetic pressure B_p , all plotted at $t = 0.01$. The grid resolution
700 $128 \times 128 \times 128$ as well as all other parameters are chosen as same as in [44] in
order to provide a direct comparison.

We tested PCM in three different plasma conditions defined by the three
different strengths of $B_x = 0, \frac{50}{\sqrt{4\pi}},$ and $\frac{100}{\sqrt{4\pi}},$ as displayed in Fig. 16(a) ~ Fig.
16 (c). Of particular interest to note is with the initial low plasma β conditions
705 in the last two cases, $\beta = 1 \times 10^{-3}$ and 2.513×10^{-4} , respectively. On the other
hand, the first setup in Fig. 16(a) produces the non-magnetized plasma flow,
hence it allows us to test the PCM algorithm in the pure hydrodynamical limit in
3D. As clearly seen, all results have produced confidently accurate solutions. We
also note that PCM has produced larger values of extrema in each variable than
710 those reported in [44], without exhibiting any unphysical oscillations. This test
demonstrate that the PCM algorithm is well-suited for simulating low- β flows
in full 3D.

(b) Magnetic Field Loop Advection – UG. Since this problem was originally stud-
ied and reported in [94], the problem has become a popular benchmark case
715 among various code developers to demonstrate their MHD algorithms’ capabil-
ities in advecting the initial field loop which is weakly magnetized with a very
high plasma $\beta = 2 \times 10^6$. The problem is known to be challenging [50, 94],
however, many have demonstrated that their codes can successfully produced
comparable results [43, 44, 83, 91, 21, 95, 96]. In addition to the two original
720 setups [50, 94] where the initial field loops advect with the angle diagonal to
the domain, Lee [44] recently reported that a small-angle advection is much
more challenging. As an example, Lee adopted the advection angle $\theta \approx 0.573^\circ$
relative to the x -axis for the small-angle advection case in both 2D and 3D. The

Figure 17: The 3D field loop advection using PCM. (a) the small angle advection with $\theta \approx 0.537^\circ$ at $t = 2$, (b) the large angle advection at $t = 2$ using $\mathbf{U} = (1, 1, 2)^T$, and (c) the standard Gardiner-Stone advection at $t = 1$. All runs were calculated on $64 \times 64 \times 128$ cells using the upwind-MEC.

study found that a proper amount of multidimensional numerical dissipation plays a key role in maintaining the clean small-angle advection, and designed the algorithm called *upwind-MEC*. Here we repeat all three configurations (two large-angle advection cases and one small-angle advection case) by following the same setups in [44]. All the results in Fig. 17 were obtained using PCM and the Roe Riemann solver with $C_{\text{eff}} = 0.8$ on $64 \times 64 \times 128$ cells.

First, Fig. 17(a) shows the small-angle advection with $\theta \approx 0.573^\circ$ relative to the x -axis with the velocity fields given by $\mathbf{U} = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 2)^T$. Compared to this, in Fig. 17(b), we use $\mathbf{U} = (1, 1, 2)^T$ which yields the large-angle advection. In both cases the tilt angle ω (see [44] for details) is set to be same as θ . As manifested, both runs cleanly preserve the initial geometry of the field loop, convincing us that the PCM algorithm is robust and accurate in this challenging problem. As a final test we also perform the standard field loop advection setup of Gardiner and Stone [50]. The result is shown in Fig. 17(c). We see clearly that the PCM algorithm has produced well-behaving, accurate and confident solutions in this test. The results in Fig. 17 can be directly compared to the results reported in [44].

7. Conclusions

We summarize key features of the PCM algorithm studied in this paper.

- We have presented a new high-order finite volume scheme for the solutions of the compressible gas dynamics and ideal MHD equations in 1D. This baseline 1D algorithm uses piecewise cubic polynomials for spatial reconstruction by adopting the non-oscillatory approximations of the fifth order WENO schemes to determine the unique piecewise cubic polynomial on each cell. To provide the nominal fifth-order accuracy in space, we have developed a new non-oscillatory WENO-type reconstruction for $q'_{C,i}$ approximation. The new approach makes use of the two parabolic polynomials, termed as *PPM-Build*, to achieve fourth-order accuracy in establishing $q'_{C,i}$ approximation.

- We have formulated a new fourth-order temporal updating scheme, all integrated in PCM by design, based on the simple predictor-corrector type characteristic tracing approach. The overall solution accuracy of the baseline 1D PCM scheme, combining both spatially and temporally, seemingly converges with fifth-order. We show the PCM scheme compares greatly with the spatially fifth-order WENO integrated with RK4, demonstrating even smaller L_1 errors in PCM.
- A comparison of the computational expenses of PCM, PPM and WENO-JS + RK4 in 1D reveals that PCM has a superior advantage over the fifth-order counterpart WENO-JS + RK4 by a factor of 1.71.
- We have integrated the baseline 1D PCM algorithm for multidimensional cases by adopting the simple dimension-by-dimension approach. As anticipated, this approach yields at most second-order accurate solutions in multidimensional simulations of smooth flows. In the presence of flow discontinuities and shocks, however, the results obtained with the present simple multidimensional PCM extension shows a great level of confidence in predicting numerical solutions of hydrodynamics and MHD. An approach to extend the fifth-order property of the baseline 1D PCM to multiple spatial dimensions will be further investigated in our future work.

8. Acknowledgements

The software used in this work was in part developed by the DOE NNSA-ASC OASCR Flash Center at the University of Chicago. D. Lee also gratefully acknowledges the FLASH group for supporting the current work. The author also thank D. S. Balsara and an anonymous referee for very helpful suggestions and comments on the manuscript.

Appendix A. Reconstruction of the Riemann States $q_{L,i}$ and $q_{R,i}$ at fifth order

780 We use the standard fifth order WENO reconstruction procedure to obtain the Riemann state values at cell interfaces. On each cell $I_i = [x_{i-1/2}, x_{i+1/2}]$, they can be explicitly written as

$$q_{L;R,i} = \sum_{\ell=1}^3 \omega_{\ell}^{\pm} p_{\ell}(x_{i\pm 1/2}), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$p_1(x_{i-1/2}) = -\frac{1}{6}\bar{q}_{i-2} + \frac{5}{6}\bar{q}_{i-1} + \frac{1}{3}\bar{q}_i, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$p_2(x_{i-1/2}) = \frac{1}{3}\bar{q}_{i-1} + \frac{5}{6}\bar{q}_i - \frac{1}{6}\bar{q}_{i+1}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$p_3(x_{i-1/2}) = \frac{11}{6}\bar{q}_i - \frac{7}{6}\bar{q}_{i+1} + \frac{1}{3}\bar{q}_{i+2}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and

$$p_1(x_{i+1/2}) = \frac{1}{3}\bar{q}_{i-2} - \frac{7}{6}\bar{q}_{i-1} + \frac{11}{6}\bar{q}_i, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$p_2(x_{i+1/2}) = -\frac{1}{6}\bar{q}_{i-1} + \frac{5}{6}\bar{q}_i + \frac{1}{3}\bar{q}_{i+1}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$p_3(x_{i+1/2}) = \frac{1}{3}\bar{q}_i + \frac{5}{6}\bar{q}_{i+1} - \frac{1}{6}\bar{q}_{i+2}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

785 The nonlinear weights $\omega_{\ell}^{\pm}$ are constructed based on one of the WENO-JS, WENO-M, or WENO-Z schemes in Eqs. (26) ~ (29). The smoothness indicators in Eqs. (26) ~ (29) are given by following the standard fifth order WENO reconstruction [11]:

$$\beta_1 = \frac{13}{12} (\bar{q}_{i-2} - 2\bar{q}_{i-1} + \bar{q}_i)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (\bar{q}_{i-2} - 4\bar{q}_{i-1} + 3\bar{q}_i)^2, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\beta_2 = \frac{13}{12} (\bar{q}_{i-1} - 2\bar{q}_i + \bar{q}_{i+1})^2 + \frac{1}{4} (\bar{q}_{i-1} - \bar{q}_{i+1})^2, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\beta_3 = \frac{13}{12} (\bar{q}_i - 2\bar{q}_{i+1} + \bar{q}_{i+2})^2 + \frac{1}{4} (3\bar{q}_i - 4\bar{q}_{i+1} + \bar{q}_{i+2})^2. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Appendix B. Reconstruction of the derivative $q'_{C,i}$ at fourth order

790 We provide explicit forms to determine $q'_{C,i}$ at fourth order on the five-point stencil $S = \{I_{i-2}, \dots, I_{i+2}\}$. The stencil S is subdivided into two four-point

sub-stencil $S_1 = \{I_{i-2}, \dots, I_{i+1}\}$ and $S_2 = \{I_{i-1}, \dots, I_{i+2}\}$ so that $S = \cup_{\ell=1}^2 S_\ell$. This strategy is based on the r=4 WENO description of Balsara and Shu [3], and is slightly modified to obtain the slope $q'_{C,i}$ in our case. Here we provide detailed expressions and derivations in Step 1 and Step 2 in Section 2.3.

Step 1. The coefficients of $\phi_\pm$ in Eq. (36) are given as

$$a_0^\pm = \frac{1}{12} \left(-\bar{q}_{i-2+s} + 7\bar{q}_{i-1+s} + 7\bar{q}_{i+s} - \bar{q}_{i+1+s} \right), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$a_1^\pm = \frac{1}{12\Delta x} \left(\bar{q}_{i-2+s} - 15\bar{q}_{i-1+s} + 15\bar{q}_{i+s} - \bar{q}_{i+1+s} \right), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$a_2^\pm = \frac{1}{4\Delta x^2} \left(\bar{q}_{i-2+s} - \bar{q}_{i-1+s} - \bar{q}_{i+s} + \bar{q}_{i+1+s} \right), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$a_3^\pm = \frac{1}{6\Delta x^3} \left(-\bar{q}_{i-2+s} + 3\bar{q}_{i-1+s} - 3\bar{q}_{i+s} + \bar{q}_{i+1+s} \right), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $s = 1$ for a_k^+ , while $s = 0$ for a_k^- .

Step 2. To determine the two linear weights $\gamma_\pm$ in Eq. (37), we first define the fourth degree polynomial $\phi(x)$ over the five-point stencil S ,

$$\phi(x) = \sum_{k=0}^4 b_k (x - x_i)^k. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Now $\gamma_\pm$ are determined by solving

$$\gamma_- \phi'_-(x_i) + \gamma_+ \phi'_+(x_i) = \phi'(x_i). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

This is equivalent to solving

$$\gamma_- \left(a_1^- + a_2^- \Delta x + 3a_3^- \frac{\Delta x^2}{4} \right) + \gamma_+ \left(a_1^+ - a_2^+ \Delta x + 3a_3^+ \frac{\Delta x^2}{4} \right) = b_1 \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where b_1 is given explicitly as

$$b_1 = \frac{5}{48} \bar{q}_{i-2} - \frac{17}{24} \bar{q}_{i-1} + \frac{17}{24} \bar{q}_{i+1} - \frac{5}{48} \bar{q}_{i+2}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

This results in $\gamma_- = \gamma_+ = \frac{1}{2}$.

References

- 805 [1] P. Colella, P. R. Woodward, The piecewise parabolic method (PPM) for
gas-dynamical simulations, *Journal of computational physics* 54 (1) (1984)
174–201.
- [2] G.-S. Jiang, C.-W. Shu, Efficient implementation of weighted ENO
schemes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 126 (1) (1996) 202–228.
- 810 [3] D. S. Balsara, C.-W. Shu, Monotonicity preserving weighted essentially
non-oscillatory schemes with increasingly high order of accuracy, *Journal
of Computational Physics* 160 (2) (2000) 405–452.
- [4] J. J. Dongarra, H. W. Meuer, H. D. Simon, E. Strohmaier, Recent trends
in high performance computing, *The Birth of Numerical Analysis* (2010)
815 93.
- [5] J. Dongarra, On the Future of High Performance Computing: How to Think
for Peta and Exascale Computing, Hong Kong University of Science and
Technology, 2012.
- [6] A. Subcommittee, Top ten exascale research challenges, US Department Of
820 Energy Report, 2014.
- [7] D. E. Keyes, L. C. McInnes, C. Woodward, W. Gropp, E. Myra, M. Pernice,
J. Bell, J. Brown, A. Clo, J. Connors, et al., Multiphysics simulations
challenges and opportunities, *International Journal of High Performance
Computing Applications* 27 (1) (2013) 4–83.
- 825 [8] R. J. LeVeque, Finite volume methods for hyperbolic problems, Vol. 31,
Cambridge university press, 2002.
- [9] R. J. LeVeque, Finite difference methods for ordinary and partial differen-
tial equations: steady-state and time-dependent problems, Vol. 98, Siam,
2007.

- 830 [10] E. Toro, Riemann Solvers and Numerical Methods for Fluid Dynamics: A Practical Introduction, Springer, 2009.
URL <http://books.google.com/books?id=SqEjX0um8o0C>
- [11] C.-W. Shu, High order weighted essentially nonoscillatory schemes for convection dominated problems, SIAM review 51 (1) (2009) 82–126.
- 835 [12] P. Buchmüller, C. Helzel, Improved accuracy of high-order WENO finite volume methods on Cartesian grids, Journal of Scientific Computing 61 (2) (2014) 343–368.
- [13] R. Zhang, M. Zhang, C.-W. Shu, On the order of accuracy and numerical performance of two classes of finite volume WENO schemes, Communica-
840 tions in Computational Physics 9 (03) (2011) 807–827.
- [14] P. McCorquodale, P. Colella, A high-order finite-volume method for conservation laws on locally refined grids, Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science 6 (1) (2011) 1–25.
- [15] V. A. Titarev, E. F. Toro, Ader: Arbitrary high order godunov approach,
845 Journal of Scientific Computing 17 (1) (2002) 609–618.
- [16] E. F. Toro, V. A. Titarev, Derivative riemann solvers for systems of conservation laws and ader methods, Journal of Computational Physics 212 (1) (2006) 150–165.
- [17] V. Titarev, E. Toro, ADER schemes for three-dimensional non-linear
850 hyperbolic systems, Journal of Computational Physics 204 (2) (2005) 715 – 736. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2004.10.028.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999104004358>
- [18] M. Dumbser, D. S. Balsara, E. F. Toro, C.-D. Munz, A unified framework
855 for the construction of one-step finite volume and discontinuous Galerkin schemes on unstructured meshes, Journal of Computational Physics 227 (2008) 8209–8253. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2008.05.025.

- [19] D. S. Balsara, T. Rumpf, M. Dumbser, C.-D. Munz, Efficient, high accuracy
ader-weno schemes for hydrodynamics and divergence-free magnetohydro-
dynamics, *Journal of Computational Physics* 228 (7) (2009) 2480–2516.
- [20] M. Dumbser, O. Zanotti, A. Hidalgo, D. S. Balsara, Ader-weno finite vol-
ume schemes with space-time adaptive mesh refinement, *Journal of Com-
putational Physics* 248 (2013) 257–286.
- [21] D. S. Balsara, C. Meyer, M. Dumbser, H. Du, Z. Xu, Efficient implementa-
tion of ader schemes for euler and magnetohydrodynamical flows on struc-
tured meshes—speed comparisons with runge-kutta methods, *Journal of*
Computational Physics 235 (2013) 934–969.
- [22] J. Qian, J. Li, S. Wang, The generalized riemann problems for compressible
fluid flows: Towards high order, *Journal of Computational Physics* 259
(2014) 358–389.
- [23] M. Dumbser, M. Käser, V. A. Titarev, E. F. Toro, Quadrature-free non-
oscillatory finite volume schemes on unstructured meshes for nonlinear hy-
perbolic systems, *Journal of Computational Physics* 226 (1) (2007) 204–243.
- [24] C.-W. Shu, Total-variation-diminishing time discretizations, *SIAM J. Sci.
and Stat. Comput.* 9 (6) (1988) 1073–1084.
- [25] S. K. Godunov, A difference method for numerical calculation of discontin-
uous solutions of the equations of hydrodynamics, *Matematicheskii Sbornik*
47(89) (3) (1959) 271–306.
- [26] J. Shi, C. Hu, C.-W. Shu, A technique of treating negative weights in
WENO schemes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 175 (1) (2002) 108–
127.
- [27] R. Borges, M. Carmona, B. Costa, W. S. Don, An improved weighted
essentially non-oscillatory scheme for hyperbolic conservation laws, *Journal*
of Computational Physics 227 (6) (2008) 3191–3211.

- 885 [28] M. Castro, B. Costa, W. S. Don, High order weighted essentially non-oscillatory WENO-Z schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws, *Journal of Computational Physics* 230 (5) (2011) 1766–1792.
- [29] J. Qiu, C.-W. Shu, Hermite WENO schemes and their application as limiters for Runge–Kutta discontinuous Galerkin method: one-dimensional case, *Journal of Computational Physics* 193 (1) (2004) 115–135.
- 890 [30] J. Qiu, C.-W. Shu, Hermite WENO schemes and their application as limiters for Runge–Kutta discontinuous Galerkin method II: Two dimensional case, *Computers & Fluids* 34 (6) (2005) 642–663.
- [31] J. Zhu, J. Qiu, Hermite WENO schemes and their application as limiters for Runge-Kutta discontinuous Galerkin method, III: unstructured meshes, *Journal of Scientific Computing* 39 (2) (2009) 293–321.
- 895 [32] D. S. Balsara, C. Altmann, C.-D. Munz, M. Dumbser, A sub-cell based indicator for troubled zones in RKDG schemes and a novel class of hybrid RKDG+HWENO schemes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 226 (1) (2007) 586–620.
- 900 [33] M. Brio, C. C. Wu, An upwind differencing scheme for the equations of ideal magnetohydrodynamics, *Journal of computational physics* 75 (2) (1988) 400–422.
- [34] A. K. Henrick, T. D. Aslam, J. M. Powers, Mapped weighted essentially non-oscillatory schemes: achieving optimal order near critical points, *Journal of Computational Physics* 207 (2) (2005) 542–567.
- 905 [35] D. S. Balsara, S. Garain, C.-W. Shu, An efficient class of weno schemes with adaptive order, *Journal of Computational Physics* 326 (2016) 780–804.
- [36] P. Colella, A direct Eulerian MUSCL scheme for gas dynamics, *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing* 6 (1) (1985) 104–117.
- 910

- [37] A. Mignone, G. Bodo, S. Massaglia, T. Matsakos, O. Tesileanu, C. Zanni, A. Ferrari, PLUTO: a numerical code for computational astrophysics, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 170 (1) (2007) 228.
- [38] A. Mignone, C. Zanni, P. Tzeferacos, B. van Straalen, P. Colella, G. Bodo,
 915 The PLUTO code for adaptive mesh computations in astrophysical fluid
 dynamics, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 198 (1) (2011) 7.
- [39] A. Mignone, P. Tzeferacos, A second-order unsplit Godunov scheme for cell-
 centered MHD: The CTU-GLM scheme, *Journal of Computational Physics*
 229 (6) (2010) 2117–2138.
- [40] J. M. Stone, T. A. Gardiner, P. Teuben, J. F. Hawley, J. B. Simon, Athena:
 920 a new code for astrophysical MHD, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement*
Series 178 (1) (2008) 137.
- [41] B. Fryxell, K. Olson, P. Ricker, F. Timmes, M. Zingale, D. Lamb, P. Mac-
 Neice, R. Rosner, J. Truran, H. Tufo, FLASH: An adaptive mesh hydrody-
 925 namics code for modeling astrophysical thermonuclear flashes, *The Astro-*
physical Journal Supplement Series 131 (1) (2000) 273.
- [42] A. Dubey, K. Antypas, M. K. Ganapathy, L. B. Reid, K. Riley, D. Sheeler,
 A. Siegel, K. Weide, Extensible component-based architecture for FLASH,
 a massively parallel, multiphysics simulation code, *Parallel Computing*
 35 (10) (2009) 512–522.
 930
- [43] D. Lee, A. E. Deane, An unsplit staggered mesh scheme for multidimen-
 sional magnetohydrodynamics, *Journal of Computational Physics* 228 (4)
 (2009) 952–975.
- [44] D. Lee, A solution accurate, efficient and stable unsplit staggered mesh
 935 scheme for three dimensional magnetohydrodynamics, *Journal of Compu-*
tational Physics 243 (2013) 269–292.

- [45] G. L. Bryan, M. L. Norman, J. M. Stone, R. Cen, J. P. Ostriker, A piecewise parabolic method for cosmological hydrodynamics, *Computer Physics Communications* 89 (1) (1995) 149–168.
- 940 [46] G. L. Bryan, M. L. Norman, B. W. O’Shea, T. Abel, J. H. Wise, M. J. Turk, D. R. Reynolds, D. C. Collins, P. Wang, S. W. Skillman, et al., Enzo: An adaptive mesh refinement code for astrophysics, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 211 (2) (2014) 19.
- 945 [47] R. Teyssier, Cosmological hydrodynamics with adaptive mesh refinement—a new high resolution code called RAMSES, *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 385 (1) (2002) 337–364.
- 950 [48] D. Lee, P. Tzeferacos, S. Couch, J. Bachan, D. C., A. Dubey, M. Fatenejad, N. Flocke, C. Graziani, D. Lamb, K. Weide, FLASH: A multi-physics code for adaptive mesh computational fluid dynamics in astrophysics, In preparation.
- [49] P. Colella, Multidimensional upwind methods for hyperbolic conservation laws, *Journal of Computational Physics* 87 (1) (1990) 171–200.
- 955 [50] T. A. Gardiner, J. M. Stone, An unsplit Godunov method for ideal MHD via constrained transport in three dimensions, *Journal of Computational Physics* 227 (8) (2008) 4123–4141.
- [51] J. Saltzman, An unsplit 3D upwind method for hyperbolic conservation laws, *Journal of Computational Physics* 115 (1) (1994) 153–168.
- [52] E. F. Toro, M. Spruce, W. Speares, Restoration of the contact surface in the HLL-Riemann solver, *Shock waves* 4 (1) (1994) 25–34.
- 960 [53] G. A. Sod, A survey of several finite difference methods for systems of nonlinear hyperbolic conservation laws, *Journal of computational physics* 27 (1) (1978) 1–31.

- [54] P. L. Roe, Approximate Riemann solvers, parameter vectors, and difference schemes, *Journal of computational physics* 43 (2) (1981) 357–372.
- 965 [55] C.-W. Shu, S. Osher, Efficient implementation of essentially non-oscillatory shock-capturing schemes, II, *Journal of Computational Physics* 83 (1) (1989) 32–78.
- [56] B. Einfeldt, C.-D. Munz, P. L. Roe, B. Sjögren, On Godunov-type methods near low densities, *Journal of computational physics* 92 (2) (1991) 273–295.
- 970 [57] P. Woodward, P. Colella, The numerical simulation of two-dimensional fluid flow with strong shocks, *Journal of computational physics* 54 (1) (1984) 115–173.
- [58] M. Torrilhon, Uniqueness conditions for Riemann problems of ideal magnetohydrodynamics, *Journal of plasma physics* 69 (03) (2003) 253–276.
- 975 [59] M. Torrilhon, Non-uniform convergence of finite volume schemes for Riemann problems of ideal magnetohydrodynamics, *Journal of Computational Physics* 192 (1) (2003) 73–94.
- [60] D. Lee, An upwind slope limiter for PPM that preserves monotonicity in magnetohydrodynamics, in: 5th International Conference of Numerical Modeling of Space Plasma Flows (ASTRONUM 2010), Vol. 444, 2011, p. 236.
- 980 [61] S. Karni, S. Čanić, Computations of slowly moving shocks, *Journal of Computational Physics* 136 (1) (1997) 132–139.
- [62] Y. Stiriba, R. Donat, A numerical study of postshock oscillations in slowly moving shock waves, *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 46 (5) (2003) 719–739.
- 985 [63] M. Arora, P. L. Roe, On postshock oscillations due to shock capturing schemes in unsteady flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 130 (1) (1997) 25–40.

- 990 [64] S. Jin, J.-G. Liu, The effects of numerical viscosities: I. slowly moving shocks, *Journal of Computational Physics* 126 (2) (1996) 373–389.
- [65] T. W. Roberts, The behavior of flux difference splitting schemes near slowly moving shock waves, *Journal of Computational Physics* 90 (1) (1990) 141–160.
- 995 [66] E. Johnsen, S. Lele, Numerical errors generated in simulations of slowly moving shocks, *Center for Turbulence Research, Annual Research Briefs* (2008) 1–12.
- [67] A. Harten, P. D. Lax, B. Van Leer, On upstream differencing and Godunov-type schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws, in: *Upwind and High-Resolution Schemes*, Springer, 1997, pp. 53–79.
- 1000 [68] S. Li, An HLLC Riemann solver for magneto-hydrodynamics, *Journal of computational physics* 203 (1) (2005) 344–357.
- [69] T. Miyoshi, K. Kusano, A multi-state HLL approximate Riemann solver for ideal magnetohydrodynamics, *Journal of Computational Physics* 208 (1) 1005 (2005) 315–344.
- [70] D. Ryu, T. Jones, Numerical magnetohydrodynamics in astrophysics: algorithm and tests for one-dimensional flow, *arXiv preprint astro-ph/9404074*.
- [71] H. C. Yee, M. Vinokur, M. J. Djomehri, Entropy splitting and numerical dissipation, *Journal of Computational Physics* 162 (1) (2000) 33–81.
- 1010 [72] D. S. Balsara, Second-order-accurate schemes for magnetohydrodynamics with divergence-free reconstruction, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 151 (1) (2004) 149.
URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0067-0049/151/i=1/a=149>
- [73] L. I. Sedov, *Similarity and dimensional methods in mechanics*, CRC press, 1015 1993.

- [74] D. S. Balsara, A two-dimensional hllc riemann solver for conservation laws: Application to euler and magnetohydrodynamic flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 231 (22) (2012) 7476–7503.
- [75] D. S. Balsara, M. Dumbser, R. Abgrall, Multidimensional hllc Riemann
1020 solver for unstructured meshes—with application to Euler and MHD flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 261 (2014) 172–208.
- [76] T. Zhang, Y. X. Zheng, Conjecture on the structure of solutions of the Riemann problem for two-dimensional gas dynamics systems, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 21 (3) (1990) 593–630.
- [77] C. W. Schulz-Rinne, Classification of the Riemann problem for two-
1025 dimensional gas dynamics, *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis* 24 (1) (1993) 76–88.
- [78] C. W. Schulz-Rinne, J. P. Collins, H. M. Glaz, Numerical solution of the Riemann problem for two-dimensional gas dynamics, *SIAM Journal on
1030 Scientific Computing* 14 (6) (1993) 1394–1414.
- [79] P. D. Lax, X.-D. Liu, Solution of two-dimensional Riemann problems of gas dynamics by positive schemes, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 19 (2) (1998) 319–340.
- [80] T. Chang, G.-Q. Chen, S. Yang, On the 2-D Riemann problem for the
1035 compressible euler equations. I. Interaction of shocks and rarefaction waves, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems* 1 (1995) 555–584.
- [81] A. Kurganov, E. Tadmor, Solution of two-dimensional Riemann problems for gas dynamics without Riemann problem solvers, *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations* 18 (5) (2002) 584–608.
- [82] W.-S. Don, Z. Gao, P. Li, X. Wen, Hybrid compact-WENO finite difference
1040 scheme with conjugate fourier shock detection algorithm for hyperbolic conservation laws, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 38 (2) (2016) A691–A711.

- [83] D. S. Balsara, Multidimensional HLLE Riemann solver: Application to Euler and magnetohydrodynamic flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 229 (6) (2010) 1970–1993.
- [84] D. Balsara, D. Spicer, A staggered mesh algorithm using high order Godunov fluxes to ensure solenoidal magnetic fields in magnetohydrodynamic simulations, *Journal of Computational Physics* 149 (2) (1999) 270–292.
- [85] G. Tóth, The $\nabla \cdot B = 0$ Constraint in Shock-Capturing Magnetohydrodynamics Codes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 161 (2) (2000) 605–652.
- [86] D. Koessl, E. Mueller, W. Hillebrandt, Numerical simulations of axially symmetric magnetized jets. I-The influence of equipartition magnetic fields. II-Apparent field structure and theoretical radio maps. III-Collimation of underexpanded jets by magnetic fields, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* 229 (1990) 378–415.
- [87] A. L. Zachary, A. Malagoli, P. Colella, A higher-order Godunov method for multidimensional ideal magnetohydrodynamics, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 15 (2) (1994) 263–284.
- [88] D. S. Balsara, M. Dumbser, Divergence-free MHD on unstructured meshes using high order finite volume schemes based on multidimensional Riemann solvers, *Journal of Computational Physics* 299 (2015) 687–715.
- [89] U. Ziegler, A semi-discrete central scheme for magnetohydrodynamics on orthogonal-curvilinear grids, *Journal of Computational Physics* 230 (4) (2011) 1035–1063.
- [90] A. Mignone, P. Tzeferacos, G. Bodo, High-order conservative finite difference GLM–MHD schemes for cell-centered MHD, *Journal of Computational Physics* 229 (17) (2010) 5896–5920.
- [91] S. Li, High order central scheme on overlapping cells for magnetohydrodynamic flows with and without constrained transport method, *Journal of Computational Physics* 227 (15) (2008) 7368–7393.

- [92] S. Kawai, Divergence-free-preserving high-order schemes for magnetohydrodynamics: An artificial magnetic resistivity method, *Journal of Computational Physics* 251 (2013) 292–318.
- 1075 [93] P. Londrillo, L. Del Zanna, High-order upwind schemes for multidimensional magnetohydrodynamics, *The Astrophysical Journal* 530 (1) (2000) 508.
- [94] T. A. Gardiner, J. M. Stone, An unsplit Godunov method for ideal MHD via constrained transport, *Journal of Computational Physics* 205 (2) (2005) 509–539.
- 1080 [95] R. Käppeli, S. Whitehouse, S. Scheidegger, U.-L. Pen, M. Liebendörfer, FISH: A three-dimensional parallel magnetohydrodynamics code for astrophysical applications, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* 195 (2) (2011) 20.
- 1085 [96] J. M. Stone, T. Gardiner, A simple unsplit Godunov method for multidimensional MHD, *New Astronomy* 14 (2) (2009) 139–148.