

Betreff: ENUMATH2019: Full Paper notification
Von: info@enumath2019.eu
Datum: 20.04.20, 16:23
An: florian.streitbuerger@math.tu-dortmund.de

Dear Florian Streitbuerger,

We are very pleased to inform that your full paper for the ENUMATH2019 proceedings

Nr. 535: Monotonicity considerations for stabilized DG cut cell schemes for the unsteady advection equation by Florian Streitbürger, Christian Engwer, Sandra May, Andreas Nüßing,

has been ACCEPTED in its present state.

In case there are any comments of the reviewer(s) you can find them at the end of this message. If you wish to make some changes you can overwrite the old version of the paper by a new one before May 31, 2020.

Please keep in mind that the layout of the full paper must fully meet the Springer requirements. In case something does not match you will be asked to change it. Can you please double check your paper?

For more information or questions, please contact the conference secretariat at:
info@enumath2019.eu

With kind regards,
Fred Vermolen
Conference chair

=====

Review Results

Title: Monotonicity considerations for stabilized DG cut cell schemes for the unsteady advection equation

Tracking Number: 535

Verdict: Accepted

===== Review Results =====

Comments to Authors:

Dear authors,

the manuscript is well written and nicely complements the paper [1]. I therefore recommend it for publication in the ENUMATH proceedings with only very minor adjustments:

- 1) p.2: please remove the word "as" just before equation (1).
- 2) p.5: please use consistent notation: "ghost penalty method" vs. "ghost-penalty method"
- 3) p. 5-6: please use consistent notation: J_h^{GP} vs. $J_{h^{\rm GP}}$ and same for system matrix \mathcal{B}_{GP} vs. $\mathcal{B}_{h^{\rm GP}}$
- 4) p. 6: please remove the extra space "stabilization [], which we introduced in [1]"
- 5) In remark 1 the authors state that "this [choice] produces better results for piecewise linear polynomials". Is it possible to make this statement more concrete?

With respect to which criteria do the authors consider the solution to be "better"? Is
is more accurate, less pronounced over/undershoots, ...