of rather generalized, small (20–70 cm in length) fishes, with dentitions lacking anterior fangs, a morphological category represented in the analysis by *Kenichthys, Gogonasus, Osteolepis* (Fig. 4a), *Medoevia*, the canniwinds and *Trichothorpus* (Fig. 4b). Rhizodonts22,27, derived tristichopterids22 and elpistostegids+tetrapods22,23,25, in contrast, show parallel trends towards a quite different morphology: they increased dramatically in size, reduced or lost their median fins, acquired diphycerhal tails with a low aspect ratio, and developed a pair of fangs at the lower jaw symphysis (Fig. 4c–e). Rhizodonts and derived tristichopterids also acquired premaxillary fangs22,27,28. Rhizodonts seem to have retained a primitive, short-snouted skull morphology (J. Jeffery, personal communication). However, tristichopterids and elpistostegids+tetrapods, having a moderately lengthened snout as a synapomorphy (Fig. 4b), independently developed this character further in parallel (Fig. 4d, e). Derived tristichopterids such as *Mandageria*23 (Fig. 4d) have very elpistostegid-like head proportions.

These changes seem to have occurred during the Middle/Late Devonian period in all three groups. Elpistostegids originated in the latest *Ctenodactylium*; the earliest known derived tristichopterid is the Frasnian *Platycephalichthys*23,27, and the earliest known large rhizodont is the Famenian *Sauripterus*23.

Our analysis indicates that much of the lower part of the tetrapodomorph stem lineage consisted of ‘osteolepiform’ fishes. The character attributes of this part of the stem lineage can be reconstructed with precision. Parallel evolution towards the morphology of a large predator, with reduced median fins and elaborate anterior dentition, occurred at about the same time in rhizodonts, tristichopterids, and elpistostegids+tetrapods (Fig. 4). The evolution of two latter clades, having extra synapomorphies, also paralleled each other more closely. The Tetrapoda thus arose out of one of several similar evolutionary ‘experiments’ with a large aquatic predator role. Closer study of these parallel radiations should cast much new light on the ecological background to the origin of tetrapods.

**Methods**

**Phylogenetic analysis.** The analysis was performed using the software package PAUP3.1 with a data matrix of 29 taxa scored for 99 morphological characters (Supplementary information). Characters were scored from specimens or good photographs, not reconstruction drawings. Most parsimonious trees were identified using the heuristic search algorithm, stepwise addition, with 500 random iterations. All characters were weighted equally. Characters were also acquired premaxillary fangs.22,27. Rhizodonts seem to have retained a primitive, short-snouted skull morphology (J. Jeffery, personal communication). However, tristichopterids and elpistostegids+tetrapods, having a moderately lengthened snout as a synapomorphy (Fig. 4b), independently developed this character further in parallel (Fig. 4d, e). Derived tristichopterids such as *Mandageria*23 (Fig. 4d) have very elpistostegid-like head proportions.

These changes seem to have occurred during the Middle/Late Devonian period in all three groups. Elpistostegids originated in the latest *Ctenodactylium*; the earliest known derived tristichopterid is the Frasnian *Platycephalichthys*23,27, and the earliest known large rhizodont is the Famenian *Sauripterus*23.

Our analysis indicates that much of the lower part of the tetrapodomorph stem lineage consisted of ‘osteolepiform’ fishes. The character attributes of this part of the stem lineage can be reconstructed with precision. Parallel evolution towards the morphology of a large predator, with reduced median fins and elaborate anterior dentition, occurred at about the same time in rhizodonts, tristichopterids, and elpistostegids+tetrapods (Fig. 4). The evolution of two latter clades, having extra synapomorphies, also paralleled each other more closely. The Tetrapoda thus arose out of one of several similar evolutionary ‘experiments’ with a large aquatic predator role. Closer study of these parallel radiations should cast much new light on the ecological background to the origin of tetrapods.

**Ecological models show that complexity usually destabilizes food webs2,23, predicting that food webs should not amass the large numbers of interacting species that are in fact found in nature2,23. Here, using nonlinear models, we study the influence of interaction strength (likelihood of consumption of one species by another) on food-web dynamics away from equilibrium. Consistent with previous suggestions1,4, our results show that weak to intermediate strength links are important in promoting community persistence and stability. Weak links act to dampen oscillations between consumers and resources. This tends to maintain population densities further away from zero, decreasing the statistical chance that a population will become extinct (lower population densities are more prone to such chances). Data on interaction strengths in natural food webs7–11 indicate that food-web interaction strengths are indeed characterized by many weak interactions and a few strong interactions. Here we combine our influence of interaction strength with modern food-web data and models, unifying verbal arguments12–16 with the rigorous formulations of May1,2. Our analysis differs from May’s contributions in five important ways. First, we use a measure of interaction strength that is based upon empirical estimates of per capita interaction strength; second, we assume that communities can display nonequilibrium dynamics; third, we construct complexity as simple food webs (after ref. 17) in a manner consistent with patterns found in nature14–16; fourth, we use biomass as the model currency; and fifth, we use consumption rates that become saturated as resource density increases (that is, we use type II functional responses). We describe our model and define terms in Box 1.
It is well known that the model food chain (Fig. 1a) exhibits several behaviours (such as stable equilibria, cycles, chaos and multiple attractors)\(^{10-20}\). In a simplified sense, the food chain is best understood by considering it as two coupled consumer–resource subsystems: a consumer–resource interaction (that is, the interaction between \(C_1\) and \(R\) in Equation set (1), box 1) and the top-predator–consumer interaction (that is, the interaction between \(P\) and \(C_1\) of Equation set (1)). For example, if the food chain is constructed from two strong consumer–resource interactions (that is, both subsystems produce cyclic behaviour) then the food chain behaviour becomes quite complex and variable\(^{10-20}\). In this case, the food chain can be seen as two coupled oscillators whose dynamics depend on whether the frequencies of these oscillators are commensurate (producing cyclic dynamics) or incommensurate (producing quasi-periodic or chaotic dynamics).

Two corollaries follow from these statements: first, stabilizing all the underlying oscillators eliminates the occurrence of cyclic or chaotic dynamics in the full system; and second, reducing the amplitude of the underlying oscillators reduces the amplitude of the dynamics of the full system. Thus we predict that inhibiting strong consumer–resource interactions within a food web promotes persistence in food webs.

We study how interaction strength influences oscillatory subsystems of more complicated food webs (Fig. 1b–f). We show that weak interactions can act to inhibit potentially oscillatory subsystems through the following three naturally occurring mechanisms.

In the apparent competition mechanism, apparent competition among resource species occurs when a consumer preys upon multiple resources. In this case, a consumer can inhibit a potentially oscillatory consumer–resource interaction when it trades off preference for one resource (that is, that resource involved in the potentially oscillatory consumer–resource interaction) in order to feed on a second resource. This effectively reduces the efficiency at which the consumer attacks the first resource.

In the exploitative competition mechanism, two consumers compete for the same resource. In this case, the addition of a second competitor reduces the growth rate of the shared resource item (from the perspective of the first consumer) and, therefore, can inhibit a potentially oscillatory consumer–resource interaction involving the first consumer.

In the food-chain–predation mechanism, food-chain predation occurs when an intermediate consumer which feeds on a resource. The top predator can inhibit the growth rate of its resource (the intermediate consumer) and, therefore, inhibit the intermediate-consumer–resource trophic interaction.

The top predator reduces the intermediate consumer’s attack rate on the resource item.

At the heart of these mechanisms is the concept that a stable consumer–resource interaction is required to dampen the dynamic
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Box 1 The food-web model

We used the following model:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dR}{dt} &= R \left( 1 - \frac{R}{K} \right) - \frac{\Omega_{iR} x_i y_i C_1 R}{\Omega_{iR} R + (1 - \Omega_{iR}) (C_1 + R)} - \frac{\Omega_{iR} x_i y_i C_2 R}{\Omega_{iR} R + (1 - \Omega_{iR}) (C_2 + R)} \\
\frac{dC_1}{dt} &= -x_i C_1 \left( 1 - \frac{\Omega_{iC_1} x_i y_i R}{\Omega_{iC_1} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_1}) (C_1 + R)} - \frac{\Omega_{iC_1} x_i y_i C_2 P}{\Omega_{iC_1} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_1}) (C_2 + C_2) + C_0} \right) \\
\frac{dC_2}{dt} &= -x_i C_1 \left( 1 - \frac{\Omega_{iC_2} x_i y_i R}{\Omega_{iC_2} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_2}) (C_1 + R)} - \frac{\Omega_{iC_2} x_i y_i C_2 P}{\Omega_{iC_2} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_2}) (C_2 + C_2) + C_0} \right) \\
\frac{dP}{dt} &= -x_i P \left( 1 - \frac{\Omega_{iP} x_i y_i C_1 + (1 - \Omega_{iP}) y_i C_2}{\Omega_{iP} C_1 + (1 - \Omega_{iP}) C_2 + C_0} \right)
\end{align*}
\]

where \(R\) is resource density, \(C_i\) is the density of the first consumer species, \(C_2\) is density of the second consumer species and \(P\) is density of the top predator. The parameters correspond to a bioenergetic interpretation of the Rosenzweig–MacArthur model\(^{18}\), in which \(K\) is the resource carrying capacity; \(R_0\) and \(C_0\) are the half-saturation densities of the resource, \(R\), and consumer, \(C_i\) respectively; \(x_i\) is the mass-specific metabolic rate of species \(i\); measured relative to the production-to-biomass ratio of the resource population; \(y_i\) is a measure of ingestion rate per unit metabolic rate of species \(i\); and \(\Omega_{ij}\) is a fraction indicating the preference of species \(j\) for consuming resource species \(j\) (ref. 29). Through choice of preference parameters \(\Omega_{ij}\), this model can be made to represent the simple food-chain model (Fig. 1a), exploitive competition (Fig. 1b), apparent competition (Fig. 1c) and intraguild predation (Fig. 1d).

Equation set (1) relies on the assumption of saturating consumption rate, \(F_{i}(j)\), such that a consumer, \(k\), captures resources \(i\) and \(j\) according to the following type II multispecies interaction functional response\(^{22}\):

\[
F_{i}(j) = F_{i}(j) + F_{i}(j) = \frac{\Omega_{iC_1} x_i y_i j}{\Omega_{iC_1} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_1}) y_i j} + \frac{\Omega_{iC_2} x_i y_i C_2 P}{\Omega_{iC_2} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_2}) (C_2 + C_2) + C_0}
\]

Equation (2) indicates the flow of biomass from resource \(i\) and \(j\) to consumer \(k\), so it is natural to define the per capital interaction strength, \(a_{ki}\), of resource species \(i\) on consumer species \(k\) as:

\[
a_{ki} = \frac{F_{i}(j)}{\Omega_{iC_1} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_1}) y_i j}
\]

We define the interaction strength, \(I_{ij}\), as the maximum per capita interaction strength of resource species \(j\) on the consumer species \(i\). As \(a_{ki}\) has its maximum when resource densities approach zero (that is, when all consumer \(i\)’s resource species approach 0), then the interaction strength is:

\[
I_{ij} = \frac{\Omega_{iC_1} x_i y_i j}{\Omega_{iC_1} R + (1 - \Omega_{iC_1}) y_i j}
\]

If we assume a type I functional response \(F_{i}(j) = \Omega_{iC_1} x_i y_i j\), then Equation (3) is the standard form for the per capita interaction strength\(^{23}\). Similarly, the interaction strength of consumer species \(i\) on resource species \(j\) can be defined to be equal in magnitude to Equation (3) and Equation (4) but opposite in sign (\(\alpha_{i} = -\alpha_{i}; I_{ij} = -I_{ij}\)).

We now estimate\(^{26}\) the maximum biologically plausible value of interaction strength \(I_{ij}\) in system (1). If we know average adult body sizes and the metabolic type (endotherm, vertebrate ectotherm or invertebrate) of species \(i\), we can then estimate biologically plausible values for \(x_i\) and for the maximum value of \(y_i\) (\(\gamma_{max}\)): this occurs when ingestion, \(y_i\), is limited by an animal’s physiological capacity. Hence, given’s preference for species \(i\) and the half-saturation density \(y_{max}\), we can estimate the interaction strength, which we call the interaction scope as it defines the maximum biologically plausible upper limit for \(I_{ij}\). In nature it is likely that consumers operate at a maximum that is some fraction of the interaction scope (at the realizable interaction scope) because of limitation by ecological factors\(^{26}\). Nevertheless, the estimates for interaction scope allow us to make some predictions concerning food-web complexity and metabolic type.

Assume that any consuming species involved in a single consumer–resource interaction is operating at its realizable interaction scope (that is, \(I_{ij} = \Omega_{iC_1} x_i y_i j\)), then choosing to consume another resource item requires that species \(i\) trade off some of its preference for consuming species \(j\) (\(\Omega_{iC_1} = 1\)), so the preference for the new resource is \(1 - I_{ij}\) (ref. 29). This allows us to compare complexity-stability arguments in a consistent manner.
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behaviour of a potentially strong interaction (and, hence, a potentially oscillatory interaction). Consistent with the theory of consumer-resource interactions, reduction in growth rates of the resource and reduction in attack rates by the consumer tend to stabilize a consumer-resource interaction \(^1\).

We now blend more food-web structure into the simple food-chain model (Fig. 1a), enabling us to study the dynamic implications of naturally occurring food-web structures.\(^2\) Looking at exploitative competition (Fig. 1b), apparent competition (Fig. 1c) and intraguild predation (in which consumer 1 feeds on both the basal resource and a second consumer (Fig. 1d)), we discuss how these mechanisms also arose in previous studies in which it was shown that adding another, appropriately directed, inhibiting bias our results to have fewer inhibitors than oscillators. Finally we show that adding another, appropriately directed, inhibiting mechanism to such a situation allows for rapid local stabilization to an equilibrium solution. Figure 2d depicts solutions to system 1 when we start off with \(I_{C_2}/I_{C_1R} = 0.11\) (Fig. 2a). Thus, we are starting off with one oscillating subsystem (the \(P-C_1\) subsystem). After adding the apparent competition mechanism, which inhibits the \(P-C_1\) subsystem, we rapidly get a locally stable solution for weak relative interaction strengths (by \(I_{Pc}/I_{PC} \approx 0.040\) in Fig. 2d).
Figure 2 The local minima and maxima for top predator density, \( P_0 \), attained in the attracting solutions for a range of relative interaction strengths. Food-web configurations are given as a function of the relative interaction strengths. Food-web configurations are given as a function of the relative interaction strength.

Using a model formulation similar to system 1, two groups have shown that weak amounts of omnivory (Fig. 1e) and allochthonous inputs (Fig. 1f) bound the magnitude of the oscillations in \( P - C_1 - R \) densities further away from zero. In both cases, chaotic dynamics collapsed through period-doubling reversals (that is, the periodicity of solutions reduced from \( n \) to \( n/2 \) to \( n/4 \) etc.) into well-bounded cyclic or stable dynamics under weak to moderate amounts of omnivory and allochthonous inputs. Both results can be explained with our proposed mechanisms.

Several testable predictions for food webs result from our study. First, if a relatively weak interaction exists for each strong consumer-resource interaction, then the food web should be stabilized relative to the oscillatory subsystems (that is, the food web should be less oscillatory). Second, if food webs have many weak interactions, then, at least form a deterministic viewpoint, chaotic dynamics are unlikely. Third, generalist-dominated food webs should exhibit less variable dynamics than specialist-dominated food webs. Fourth, depauperate food webs should tend to be more oscillatory than reticulate food webs as depauperate food web species tend to have larger average interaction strengths, thus promoting the dominance of a few strong (oscillatory) interactions. Finally, if we assume the realistic interaction scope is proportional to interaction scope, then given all else equal, endotherms \((Y_{\text{max}}) \geq 1.60\) and vertebrate ectotherms \((Y_{\text{max}}) \leq 3.90\) are more likely to be stabilized by weak food web links than invertebrates as invertebrates have a greater interaction scope (since \( Y_{\text{max}} \geq 19.4 \)) and thus greater potential to maintain a larger number of strong consumer-resource interactions. A larger number of strong consumer-resource interactions requires a greater number of weak interactions to inhibit oscillatory subsystems. It follows, given topologically identical food webs, that vertebrate-dominated communities are more likely to have the most oscillatory dynamics. Our overall conclusion is that knowledge of interaction strength in study of food webs is vital. Although few quantitative fi eldestimates of interaction strength are available, early data unequivocally indicate that distributions of interaction strength are strongly skewed towards weak interactions\(^7\). It seems, then, that weak interactions may be the glue that binds natural communities together.
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A shaky hand holding a video camera invariably turns a treasured moment into an annoying, jittery moment. More recent consumer cameras thoughtfully offer stabilization mechanisms to compensate for our unsteady grip. Our eyes face a similar challenge in that they are constantly making small movements even when we try to maintain a fixed gaze. What should be substantial, distracting jitter passes completely unseen. Position changes from large eye movements (saccades) seem to be corrected on the basis of extraretinal signals such as the motor commands sent to the eye muscles, and the resulting motion responses seem to be simply switched off. But this approach is impracticable for incessant, small displacements, and here we describe a novel visual illusion that reveals a compensation mechanism based on visual motion signals. Observers were adapted to a patch of dynamic random noise and then viewed a larger pattern of static random noise. The static noise in the unadapted regions then appeared to ‘jitter’ coherently in random directions. Several observations indicate that this visual jitter directly reflects fixational eye movements. We propose a model that accounts for this illusion as well as the stability of the visual world during small and/or slow eye movements such as fixational drift, smooth pursuit and low-amplitude mechanical vibrations of the eyes.

The experimental setting required for this illusion has three conditions: (1) adaptation to dynamic random noise in a local region (referred to as the adapted area) for at least several seconds; (2) a successive test with static random noise in the adapted area plus static noise in a region somewhere near the adapted area (referred to as the unadapted area); and (3) maintained fixation throughout these two periods. During the adaptation period, static noise is typically presented in the unadapted region (Fig. 1a), although leaving it blank does not change the outcome (Fig. 1b). After adaptation, static noise presented in the unadapted region seems to jitter rigidly (all dots moving together) in random directions for several seconds. In contrast, the static noise in the
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**Figure 1** A schematic view of the stimulus configuration and perception. a–e. The various configurations used in these experiments and their outcomes. A fixation point is typically provided at the centre of the stimulus, but the illusion occurs for peripheral viewing as well. A and U stand for adapted and unadapted (static or blank) regions, respectively. The blur of circles and crosses in the test stimuli depicts the visual jitter schematically. See http://visionlab.harvard.edu/ for demonstrations.