

Paper Code: PCS-01	Roll No.									

PrePhD
Odd SEMESTER EXAMINATION, 2016-17
AN INTRODUCTION TO FORMAL METHOD

[Time: 3 Hours]

[Max. Marks: 100]

Note:- Attempt All questions. All questions carry equal marks. Assume suitable data if required.

1. Attempt any three parts of the following:- **[10x3=30]**

- (a) If n does not appear in the free names of P show that $(\text{new } n)P \equiv P$.
- (b) In context of APi , prove that reduction barbed congruence implies the synchronous weak bisimulation.
- (c) What is the analogy between π -calculus and λ -calculus?
- (d) If a language is obtained by omitting the matching construct from APi then show that full abstraction for this new language will not hold.
- (e) Prove that in a synchronous pi-calculus, $P \approx Q$ implies $P|R \approx Q|R$.

2. Attempt any two parts of the following:- **[10x2=20]**

- (a) Prove that if $\Gamma \vdash (\text{new } n : D)R$ then D is to be channel type in R .
- (b) Prove that bi-simulation equivalence is still an equivalence RELATION in a typed setting.
- (c) Provide an example to demonstrate the justification for two syntactic categories in distributed pi-calculus.

3. Attempt any two parts of the following:- **[10x2=20]**

- (a) Suppose in typed pi calculus setting $c \vdash M$ is used to explain a pi calculus process M with respect to a cost of communication along a channel. The cost setting c is pre defined and analogous to the typed setting. Can you develop a LTS for such pi calculus?
- (b) With a suitable example, show that how the typical π -calculus can implement a mobile phone token handover from one base station to another base station. What were the limitations with in CCS/CSP to implement the same?
- (c) Justify why graph isomorphism or automata equivalence are not sufficient to establish concurrent process equivalence.

4. Attempt the following:-

[30x1=30]

Let us define a mini asynchronous pi-calculus process as $P : = ?c(x) !c < v > | P | Q$ if $u = v$ then P else Q using simple values u, v, \dots and channel name c [notations have usual meanings]. The reduction semantics has usual communication, contextual and value match/mismatch rules. Develop an appropriate

(i) Reduction Semantics

(ii) Action Semantics

and show that a touchstone equivalence (defined over reduction semantics) as “observational equivalence” coincides with asynchronous bi-simulation (defined over action semantics).