MODELLING AND VERIFICATION ANALYSIS OF 
THE BIOLOGICAL INTERACTION BETWEEN SPECIES 
VIA A MODAL LOGIC APPROACH 

ZVI RETCHKIMAN KÖNIGSBERG 
Instituto Politécnico Nacional, CIC 
Mineria 17-2, Col. Escandon, Mexico D.F 11800, MEXICO 

ABSTRACT: This paper addresses the interactions, among organisms of 
the same or different species associated with the need for a common resource 
that occurs in a limited supply relative to demand. If two competitors try 
to occupy the same realized niche, one species will try to eliminate the other. 
Therefore, two cases are worth to be considered. On the one hand, there is 
a need to cooperate sharing part of the resource so that both organisms will 
benefit from it. On the other hand, if one of the two species is stronger than 
the other, there will be no cooperation and the strongest species will impose its 
conditions. In the study of this interaction Lotka-Volterra models have been 
used. Other non-classical methodologies as Petri nets and first order logic have 
been employed too. In this work, the biological competition problem between 
species is modelled as a modal logic formula. Then, using the concept of logic 
implication, and transforming this logical implication relation into a set of 
clauses, a modal resolution qualitative method for verification (satisfiability) 
as well as performance issues, for some queries is applied.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the biological competition problem among organisms of the same or different species associated with the need for a common resource that occurs in a limited supply relative to demand. In other words, competition better defined as interaction occurs when the capability of the environment to supply resources is smaller than the potential biological requirement so that organisms interfere with each other. More concisely we can say that competition is the interaction between individuals of the same or different species leading to an increase of the fitness of one at the expense of the other. Plants, for example, often compete for access to a limited supply of nutrients, water, sunlight, and space. Therefore, two species cannot indefinitely coexist if they are limited by the same resource. If two competitors try to occupy the same realized niche, one species will try to eliminate the other [4]. Therefore, two cases are worth to be considered. On the one hand, there is a need to cooperate sharing part of the resource so that both organisms will benefit from it. On the other hand, if one of the two species is stronger than the other, there will be no cooperation and the strongest species will impose its conditions. In the study of this interaction Lotka-Volterra models have been used [4]. Other non-classical methodologies as Petri nets and first order logic have been employed too ([5] and [6]). This paper proposes a well defined syntax modeling and verification analysis methodology which consists in representing the biological competition system as a modal logic formula. This approach allows to represent both cases, the cooperative and non cooperative ones, in one formula and not as two separate formulas (see [6]) and, it also models other behavioral possibilities not always easy to represent using other techniques. The modal logic approach introduces two new operators that enable abstract relations like necessarily true and possibly true to be expressed directly, called alethic modalities, what is not possible using first order logic. For example, the statement: 7 is a prime number, is necessarily true always and everywhere, in contrast, the statement the head of state of this country is a king is possibly true, because its truth changes from place to place and from time to time. Other modalities that have been formalized in modal logic include temporal modalities, or modalities of time, deontic modalities, epistemic modalities, and doxastic modalities. The main idea consists in modeling the biological competition system by means
of a modal logic formula. Then, using the concept of logic implication, and transforming this logical implication relation into a set of clauses, a modal resolution qualitative method for verification (satisfiability) as well as performance issues, for some queries is applied. The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, a modal logic background summary is given. In section 3, the modal resolution principle for unsatisfiability, is recalled. In section 4, the biological competition problem is addressed. The cooperative and non cooperative cases are considered. Finally, the paper ends with some conclusions.

2. MODAL LOGIC BACKGROUND

This section presents a summary of modal logic theory. The reader interested in more details is encouraged to see [7, 8].

**Definition 1.** A modal language \( \mathcal{L} \) is an infinite collection of distinct symbols, no one of which is properly contained in another, separated into the following categories: parentheses, connectives, possibility modality, necessity modality, proposition variables \( \Phi_0 = \{p_1, p_2, \cdots \} \) (called atoms), contradiction (falsity), true (tautology).

**Definition 2.** Well-formed formulas, or formulas for short, in modal logic are defined recursively as follows: (i). An atom is a formula, \( \bot \) (false is a formula), \( T \) (true is a formula) (ii). If \( F \) and \( G \) are formulas then, \( \sim (F) \), \( (F \lor G) \), \( (F \land G) \), \( (F \leftrightarrow G) \), \( \Box F \), \( \Diamond F \), are formulas. \( \Diamond A \equiv \neg \Box \neg A \). Formulas are generated only by a finite number of applications of (i) and (ii), therefore the set of well-formed formulas is enumerable infinite.

**Remark 3.** It is important to underline the unique readability of the formulas which is secured by the assumption that the operators are one to one.

**Definition 4.** A Kripke frame (frame) \( \mathcal{F} \) is a pair \((W, \mathcal{R})\) in which \( W \) is a set of worlds (time, states, etc), and \( \mathcal{R} \subseteq W \times W \) is a binary relation over \( W \).

**Definition 5.** A Kripke model (model) \( \mathcal{M} \) over frame \( \mathcal{F} \) is a triple \((\mathcal{F}, \pi) = (W, \mathcal{R}, \pi)\) where \( \pi : \Phi_0 \rightarrow 2^W \) the set of worlds where each element of \( \Phi_0 \) is true is an assignment or interpretation.
Definition 6. Given any model $\mathcal{M}$, a world $w \in W$, the notion of true at $w$ is defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{M}, w \models p_n \iff w \in \pi(p_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$;
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \neg F \iff w \not\models F$;
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models F \land G \iff w \models F$ and $w \models G$;
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models F \lor G \iff w \models F$ or $w \models G$;
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models F \rightarrow G \iff$ if $w \models F$ then $w \models G$;
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models F \equiv G \iff w \models F$ iff $w \models G$;
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \diamond F \iff$ there exists $u \in W$ such that $(w, u) \in R$, $\mathcal{M}, u \models F$;
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \Box F \iff$ for all $u \in W$ such that $(w, u) \in R$, $\mathcal{M}, u \models F$.

Definition 7. A formula $F$ is consistent (satisfiable, true at $w$) in a model $\mathcal{M}$ in a world $w \in W$ iff $\mathcal{M}, w \models F$, then we say that $\mathcal{M}$ is a model for $F$. If this happens for all worlds $w \in W$ then we say it is true.

Definition 8. A formula $F$ is inconsistent (unsatisfiable) in a model $\mathcal{M}$ iff $\mathcal{M}, w \not\models F$ for every world $w \in W$, then we say that $\mathcal{M}$ is a countermodel for $F$.

Definition 9. A formula $F$ is valid in a class of models $\mathcal{CM}$ if and only if it is true for all models in the class. This will be denoted by $\models_{\mathcal{CM}} F$.

Definition 10. A formula $F$ is valid iff it is valid for every class of models $\mathcal{CM}$. This will be denoted by $\models F$.

Definition 11. A formula $G$ is a logical implication of formulas $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n$ if and only if for every model $\mathcal{M}$, that makes $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n$ true, $G$ is also true in $\mathcal{M}$.

The following characterization of logical implication plays a very important role as will be shown in the rest of the paper.

Theorem 12. Given formulas $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n, G$, $G$ is a logical implication of $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n$ if and only if the formula $((F_1 \land F_2 \land \ldots \land F_n) \rightarrow G)$ is valid
in a class of models if and only if the formula \((F_1 \land F_2 \land \ldots \land F_n \land \sim (G))\) is unsatisfiable.

**Proof.** Setting the class of models equal to all the models that make \(F_1 \land F_2 \land \ldots \land F_n\) true. The first iff follows directly by the definition of validity in a class of models, and logical implication. For the second one, since \(F_1 \land F_2 \land \ldots \land F_n \rightarrow G\) is valid in a class of models, every model that makes \(F_1 \land F_2 \land \ldots \land F_n\) true does not satisfy \(\sim (G)\), therefore \((F_1 \land F_2 \land \ldots \land F_n \land \sim (G))\) can not be satisfied. Reversing this last argument we obtain the last implication.

Next, given a class of models \(CM\), we define the syntactic mechanisms capable of generating the formulas valid on \(CM\).

**Axioms:** (1). All instances of propositional logic tautologies.
(2). \(\Box (F \rightarrow G) \rightarrow \Box F \rightarrow \Box G\).

**Rules of inference:** (1). Modus ponens

\[
\frac{F, F \rightarrow G}{G}
\]

(2). Necessitation

\[
\frac{F}{\Box G}.
\]

We write \(\vdash F\) if \(F\) can be deduced from the axioms and the inference rules.

**Theorem 13.** (Completeness [7]) A formula \(F\) is valid iff it is provable i.e.,

\[\models F \iff \vdash F\]

**Definition 14.** A formula \(F\) in modal logic is said to be in disjunctive normal form normal (DNF) if and only if is a disjunction (perhaps with zero disjunct) of the form \(F = L_1 \lor L_2 \lor \ldots \lor L_n \lor \Box D_1 \lor \Box D_2 \lor \ldots \lor \Box D_m \lor \Diamond H_1 \lor \Diamond H_2 \lor \ldots \lor \Diamond H_j\), where each \(L_i\) is an atom or its negation, each \(D_i\) is a DNF, and each \(H_i\) is a CNF (next defined). A formula \(G\) is said to be in conjunctive normal form (CNF) if it is a conjunction of \(F_i\) DNF i.e., \(G = F_1 \land F_2 \land \cdots \land F_n\) which will be denoted by the set \(G = \{F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n\}\)

**Definition 15.** A formula in DNF is called a clause. A clause with only one element is called a unit clause. A clause with zero disjunct is empty and it
will be denoted by the ⊥ symbol. Since the empty clause has no literal that can be satisfied by a model, the empty clause is always false.

**Definition 16.** The modal degree of a formula \( F \) denoted by \( d(F) \) is recursively defined as follows:

- if \( F \) is a literal then its degree is zero;
- \( d(F \triangle G) = \max(d(F), d(G)) \), where \( \triangle \) is \( \land \) or \( \lor \);
- \( d(\sim F)) = d(F) \);
- \( d(\nabla F) = d(F) + 1 \), where \( \nabla \) stands for \( \square \) or \( \Diamond \).

Given a formula \( F \), the following inductive procedure transforms \( F \) into a CNF in such a way that the original formula is equal to its CNF form therefore satisfying validity. (1) Using axioms 1 and 2, the definition \( \sim \square F \equiv \Diamond \sim F \) and the inference rules, eliminate all propositional other than \( \land, \lor, \sim \) and move negations inside so that they are immediately before propositional variables, (2) If \( d(F) = 0 \) then apply the propositional procedure [9], (3) If \( F = \square F_1 \) with \( F_1 \) in CNF, apply the theorem \( \square(F \land G) \equiv \square F \land \square G \) to distribute the \( \square \) operator (this is proved with the aid of axiom 2). (4) If \( F = \Diamond F_1 \) with \( F_1 \) in CNF, then do not do anything. (5) Otherwise, we have a combination of different formulas which can be handled using the preceding rules.

Therefore, we have proved the following result.

**Theorem 17.** Let \( S \) be a set of clauses that represents a formula \( F \) in its CNF. Then \( F \) is unsatisfiable if and only if \( S \) is unsatisfiable.

### 3. THE MODAL LOGIC RESOLUTION PRINCIPLE

We shall next present the resolution principle inspired by the propositional logic resolution principle introduced by Robinson (see [9], the references quoted therein, and [10]). It can be applied directly to any set \( S \) of clauses to test the unsatisfiability of \( S \). Resolution is a decidable, sound and complete proof system i.e., a formula in clausal form is unsatisfiable if and only if there exists
an algorithm reporting that it is unsatisfiable. Therefore it provides a consistent methodology free of contradictions. It is composed of rules for computing resolvents, simplification rules and rules of inference. The first ones compute resolvents, simplified by the simplification rules, and then inferred by the rules of inference.

**Definition 18.** [10] Let $\Sigma(A, B) \rightarrow C$, and $\Gamma(A) \rightarrow C$ be two relations on clauses defined by the following formal system:

**Axioms:**

(1). $\Sigma(p, \sim p) \rightarrow \bot$.
(2). $\Sigma(\bot, A) \rightarrow \bot$.

**$\Sigma$ rules:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\lor - \text{rule} : & \quad \Sigma(A, B) \rightarrow C \\
& \quad \Sigma(A \lor D_1, B \lor D_2) \rightarrow C \lor D_1 \lor D_2 \\
\boxdot \boxdot - \text{rule} : & \quad \Sigma(A, B) \rightarrow C \\
& \quad \Sigma(\boxdot A, \boxdot(B, E)) \rightarrow \boxdot(B, C, E) \\
\boxdot \boxdot - \text{rule} : & \quad \Sigma(A, B) \rightarrow C \\
& \quad \Sigma(\boxdot A, \boxdot B) \rightarrow \boxdot C
\end{align*}
\]

**$\Gamma$ rules:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\boxdot - \text{rule } 1 : & \quad \Sigma(A, B) \rightarrow C \\
& \quad \Gamma(\boxdot(A, B, F)) \rightarrow \boxdot(A, B, C, F) \\
\boxdot - \text{rule } 2 : & \quad \Gamma(A) \rightarrow B \\
& \quad \Gamma(\boxdot(A, F)) \rightarrow \boxdot(B, A, F) \\
\lor - \text{rule} : & \quad \Gamma(A) \rightarrow B \\
& \quad \Gamma(A \lor C) \rightarrow B \lor C \\
\boxdot - \text{rule} : & \quad \Gamma(A) \rightarrow B \\
& \quad \Gamma(\boxdot A) \rightarrow \boxdot B
\end{align*}
\]

where $A, B, C, D, D_1, D_2$, denote general clauses, $E, F$ denote sets (conjunctions) of clauses, and $(A < E)$ denotes the result of appending the clauses $A$ to the set $E$.

**Simplification rules:**

The relation ’$A$ can be simplified in $B’$ denoted $A \simeq B$ is the least congruence relation containing: (S1) $\boxdot \bot \simeq \bot$, (S2) $\bot \lor D \simeq D$, (S3) $\bot, E \simeq \bot$, (S4)
$A \lor A \lor D \simeq A \lor D$. The simplified formula obtained is called the normal form of the original formula and is the one to be considered when computing resolvents.

**Inference rules:**

(R1). \[
\begin{array}{c}
C \\
\hline
D
\end{array}
\text{ if } \Gamma(C) \rightarrow D
\]

(R2). \[
\begin{array}{c}
C_1 \\
C_2 \\
\hline
D
\end{array}
\text{ if } \Sigma(C_1, C_2) \rightarrow D,
\]

where $C, C_1, C_2, D$ are general clauses.

A deduction of a clause $D$ from a set $S$ of clauses can be seen as a tree whose root is $D$, whose leaves are clauses of $S$, and every internal node $C$ has sons $A$ and $B$ (respectively $A$) iff the rule R2 (respectively Rl) can be applied with premises $A$ and $B$ (respectively $A$) and conclusion $C$. The size of a deduction is the number of nodes of this tree. We say that $D$ is an-consequence of $S$ iff there is a deduction of $D$ from $S$ denoted by $S \vdash D$. These definitions and notations are extended to sets of consequences: if $S'$ is a set of clauses, $S \vdash S'$ iff $S \vdash D$ for every $D \in S'$. A deduction of $\bot$ from $S$ is a refutation of $S$.

**Theorem 19.** [10] The resolution proof system is decidable.

The main two results of this subsection: the completeness theorem for the resolution proof system, and that proofs in the resolution proof system are actually proofs in our modal logic axiomatic system are next presented.

**Theorem 20.** [10] A set $S$ of clauses is unsatisfiable if and only if there is a deduction of the empty clause $\bot$ from $S$.

**Theorem 21.** If there exists a deduction $D$ from $S$ in the resolution proof system then there is a deduction $D$ from $S$ in our modal logic axiomatic system.

**Proof.** Let us proceed by induction on the length of the deduction. Base case: the deduction is an axiom i.e., it is either $\Sigma(p, \sim p) \rightarrow \bot$ or $\Sigma(\bot, A) \rightarrow \bot$ which in our modal logic system correspond to $p \land \sim p \rightarrow \bot$ and $\bot \land A \rightarrow \bot$ which are propositional logic tautologies. Next, let us assume that the conclusion
holds for every deduction of length less than or equal to $k - 1$. Then, we have a deduction of $S_{k-1}$ from $S$ in our modal logic system and a one length deduction in the resolution proof system of $S_k$ from $S_{k-1}$ which turns out to be also a deduction in our modal logic system (due to the induction hypothesis). Therefore concatenating both we get a deduction of $S_k$ from $S$.

\[ \square \]

**Remark 22.** Indeed it is straightforward to show that one length deductions in the resolution proof system are deductions in our modal logic system, since they are the result of applying the $\Sigma$ and $\Gamma$ rules, see [10]. This gives the possibility of providing another proof, but now proceeding by weak induction.

### 4. THE BIOLOGICAL COMPETITION PROBLEM

Consider the biological competition problem among organisms of the same or different species associated with the need for a common resource that occurs in a limited supply relative to demand. In other words, competition better defined as interaction occurs when the capability of the environment to supply resources is smaller than the potential biological requirement so that organisms interfere with each other. Plants, for example, often compete for access to a limited supply of nutrients, water, sunlight, and space. Therefore, two species cannot indefinitely coexist if they are limited by the same resource. If two competitors try to occupy the same realized niche, one species will try to eliminate the other. Therefore, there is a need to cooperate sharing part of the resource so that both organisms will benefit from it. However, when one of the two species is stronger than the other, and as a consequence there is no need to cooperate, the strongest species finishes imposing its conditions. The modal logic allows to represent, the cooperative and non cooperative cases, in one formula and, it also models other behavioral possibilities not always easy to represent using other techniques. The biological competition system behavior is described as follows:

(1) Propositional variables: $S$: resources are safe, $D$: the resources are in danger, $B$: the resources are being eaten, $I_1, I_2$: the organisms are inactive, $L_1, L_2$: the organisms are in search for a resource, $CL_1, CL_2$: the organisms continue searching for a resource, $A_1, A_2$: the organisms attack the resource,
Remark 23. It is important to underline that the inference rules express the cooperative and non-cooperative behavior of the biological competition system over the resource. In the cooperative case one organism takes control over the resource while the other one stays apart. This cooperative competitive behavior differs from the strictly competitive where there exists just one of the organisms (the winner) who takes completely control of the resource.

Remark 24. The main idea consists of: the biological competition system behavior is expressed by a modal logic formula, some query is expressed as an additional formula. The query is assumed to be a logical implication of the biological competition formula (see theorem 12). Then, transforming this logical implication relation into a set of clauses by using the techniques given in section 3, its validity can be checked. It is important to point out that other type of behaviors can be incorporated in to the model by the modeler, making it as close to reality as needed.
The formula that models the biological competition system behavior turns out to be:

\[ [S \land L_1 \land L_2 \rightarrow CL_1 \land CL_2] \tag{1} \]

\[
[S \land CL_1 \land CL_2 \rightarrow \diamond P_1 \land \diamond P_2] \land [D \land (L_1 \lor CL_1) \land \sim (L_2 \lor CL_2) \rightarrow A_1 \land \sim A_2] \land [D \land \sim (L_1 \lor CL_1) \land (L_2 \lor CL_2) \rightarrow A_1 \land A_2] \land [A_1 \land \sim A_2 \rightarrow B_1 \land \sim B_2] \land \sim A_1 \land A_2 \rightarrow B_1 \land B_2 \land [(B_1 \land \sim B_2 \rightarrow F_1 \land \sim F_2)] \land \sim B_1 \land B_2 \rightarrow F_1 \land F_2 \land [F_1 \land \sim F_2 \rightarrow I_1 \land \sim I_2] \land \sim F_1 \land F_2 \land I_1 \land I_2 \land [I_1 \land \sim I_2 \rightarrow L_1 \land \sim L_2] \land [I_1 \land L_2 \rightarrow L_1 \land L_2] \land [D \land (L_1 \lor CL_1) \land (L_2 \lor CL_2) \land \Box S_1 \rightarrow A_1 \land E_1] \land [D \land (L_1 \lor CL_1) \land (L_2 \lor CL_2) \land \Box S_2 \rightarrow A_2 \land E_2] \land [E_1 \rightarrow (L_2 \lor CL_2) \land \sim A_2 \land \sim B_2 \land \sim F_2 \land \sim I_2] \land [E_2 \rightarrow (L_1 \lor CL_1) \land \sim A_1 \land \sim B_1 \land \sim F_1 \land \sim I_1] \land [D \lor \diamond A_1 \lor \diamond A_2] \land [\diamond A_1 \land \diamond A_2 \rightarrow \Box A_1 \land \Box A_2] \land [\Box A_1 \land \Box S_1 \rightarrow A_1 \land E_1] \land [\Box A_2 \land \Box S_2 \rightarrow A_2 \land E_2] \land [\Box A_1 \land \Box S_2 \rightarrow A_2 \land E_2] \land [\Box A_2 \land \Box S_1 \rightarrow A_1 \land E_1] .

We are interested in verifying the following statements:

(S1) Claim: In the cooperative case, we want to verify that in the case when one of the organisms takes control over the resource the other one stays apart i.e., if \( D \) and \( ((L_1 \lor CL_1) \land \sim (L_2 \lor CL_2)) \) then \( B_1 \) and \( \sim (B_2) \). Specifically, we want to know if the following formula is a logical implication of equation 1: \( D \land (L_1 \lor CL_1) \land \sim (L_2 \lor CL_2) \rightarrow B_1 \land \sim B_2 \)

The set of clauses for this case is given by: \( S = \{ (\sim S \lor \sim L_1 \lor \sim L_2 \lor CL_1), (\sim S \lor \sim L_1 \lor \sim L_2 \lor CL_2), (\sim S \lor \sim CL_1 \lor \sim CL_2 \lor \Diamond P_1), (\sim S \lor \sim CL_1 \lor \sim CL_2 \lor \Diamond P_2), (\sim D \lor \sim L_1 \lor CL_2 \lor CL_2 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor \sim L_1 \lor CL_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim A_2), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor CL_1 \lor CL_2 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor CL_1 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim A_2), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor CL_1 \lor CL_2 \lor \Diamond A_1), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor CL_1 \lor CL_2 \lor \Diamond B_1), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor CL_1 \lor CL_2 \lor \Diamond S_1) \} \).
Then applying the $\Sigma \lor$ rule, a resolution refutation proof for $S$, is as follows:

(a) $(\sim A_1 \lor A_2 \lor B_1)(\sim B_1 \lor B_2) \rightarrow (\sim A_1 \lor A_2 \lor B_2)$.

(b) $(\sim A_1 \lor A_2 \lor B_2)(\sim A_1 \lor A_2 \lor B_2) \rightarrow (\sim A_1 \lor A_2)$.

(c) $(\sim D \lor \sim C L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor \sim A_2)(D)(\sim L_2)(\sim C L_2) \rightarrow (\sim C L_1 \lor \sim A_2)$.

(d) $(\sim D \lor \sim L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor \sim A_2)(D)(\sim L_2)(\sim C L_2) \rightarrow (\sim L_1 \lor \sim A_2)$.

(e) $(\sim L_1 \lor \sim A_2)(L_1 \lor C L_1) \rightarrow (C L_1 \lor \sim A_2)$.

(f) $(\sim C L_1 \lor \sim A_2)(C L_1 \lor \sim A_2) \rightarrow (\sim A_2)$.

(g) $(\sim D \lor \sim C L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor A_1)(D)(\sim L_2)(\sim C L_2) \rightarrow (\sim C L_1 \lor A_1)$.

(h) $(\sim D \lor \sim L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor A_1)(D)(\sim L_2)(\sim C L_2) \rightarrow (\sim L_1 \lor A_1)$.

(i) $(\sim L_1 \lor A_1)(L_1 \lor C L_1) \rightarrow (C L_1 \lor A_1)$.

(j) $(\sim C L_1 \lor A_1)(C L_1 \lor A_1) \rightarrow A_1$.

Now, from (b) and (j) we get:

(k) $(\sim A_1 \lor A_2)(A_1) \rightarrow A_2$.

Therefore, from the conclusion of (f) and (k), we get a proof of $S$ i.e., $\bot$.

(S2) Claim: For the non cooperative case, we want to verify that when the resource is in danger and there is a possibility of attack by both organisms, the stronger organism is the one who takes control over the resource, and not being this enough, he decides to eliminate his opponent. Specifically, we want to know if the following formula is a logical implication of equation 1:

$D \land A_1 \land A_2 \land \square S_1 \rightarrow A_1 \land E_1$

The set of clauses for this case is given by: $S = \{(\sim S \lor \sim L_1 \lor \sim L_2 \lor C L_1), (\sim S \lor \sim L_1 \lor \sim L_2 \lor C L_2), (\sim S \lor \sim C L_1 \lor \sim C L_2 \lor \lor P_1), (\sim S \lor \sim C L_1 \lor \sim C L_2 \lor \lor P_2), (\sim D \lor \sim L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor \sim L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor \sim A_2), (\sim D \lor \sim C L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor \sim C L_1 \lor L_2 \lor C L_2 \lor \sim A_2), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor L_1 \lor C L_1 \lor \sim A_1), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor L_1 \lor C L_1 \lor A_2), (\sim D \lor \sim L_2 \lor L_1 \lor \lor C L_1 \lor \lor C L_2 \lor \lor A_2), (\sim A_1 \lor A_2 \lor B_1), (\sim A_1 \lor A_2 \lor B_2), (\sim B_1 \lor B_2 \lor F_1), (\sim B_1 \lor B_2 \lor F_2), (\sim B_2 \lor B_1 \lor F_1), (\sim B_2 \lor B_1 \lor F_2), (\sim F_1 \lor F_2 \lor \lor I_1), (\sim F_1 \lor F_2 \lor \lor I_2)\}$
The main contribution of the paper consists in the study of the biological interaction between species (I2), (\sim F_2 \lor F_1 \lor \sim I_1), (\sim F_2 \lor F_1 \lor I_2), (\sim I_1 \lor I_2 \lor L_1), (\sim I_2 \lor I_1 \lor L_1), (\sim D \lor L_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_1), (\sim D \sim L_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor E_1), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor E_1), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor E_1), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_1), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor E_2), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_2), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor E_2), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_2), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor E_2), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_2), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor E_2), (\sim D \lor CL_1 \lor L_2 \lor CL_2 \lor \sim S_1 \lor A_2)

Then applying the \Sigma \lor rule, the \Sigma \Box \lor rule and the simplifications rules, a resolution refutation proof for S, is as follows:

(a) (\Box \sim A_1 \lor \Box \sim A_2 \lor \Box A_1)(\Box A_1)(\Box A_2) \rightarrow (\Box A_1).
(b) (\Box \sim A_1 \lor \Box \sim S_1 \lor A_1)(\Box S_1) \rightarrow (\Box \sim A_1 \lor A_1).
(c) (\Box \sim A_1 \lor A_1)(\Box A_1) \rightarrow (\Box A_1).
(d) (\Box \sim A_1 \lor E_1)(A_1) \rightarrow (\Box E_1).
(e) (\Box \sim A_1 \lor \Box \sim S_1 \lor E_1)(\Box S_1) \rightarrow (\Box \sim A_1 \lor E_1).
(f) (\Box \sim A_1 \lor E_1)(\Box A_1) \rightarrow (E_1).

Therefore, from the conclusion of (d) and (f), we get a proof of S i.e., \bot.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The main contribution of the paper consists in the study of the biological competition system by means of a formal reasoning deductive methodology based on modal logic theory. The cooperative and non cooperative cases were addressed. Verification (validity) as well as performance issues, for some queries were addressed.
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