TOPOLOGICALLY STABLE AND $\beta$-PERSISTENT POINTS OF GROUP ACTIONS
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Abstract. In this paper, we introduce topologically stable points and $\beta$-persistent points for finitely generated group actions on compact metric spaces. We prove that every shadowable point of an expansive action on a compact metric space is a topologically stable point. We justify that the expansivity of an action is not a necessary condition for the topological stability of a shadowable point of that action and the existence of a dense set of topologically stable points need not imply the topological stability of that action. Finally, we prove that every equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable action on a compact metric space is $\beta$-persistent.

1. Introduction

In [22], Utz called a homeomorphism to be unstable, if the orbits of any two distinct points under the homeomorphism can be made a constant distance apart at some instant of integer time. Later such homeomorphisms are termed as expansive homeomorphisms [2]. In the discrete topological dynamics, a motivation for the concept of shadowing comes from the aim of tracing pseudo trajectories by an actual trajectory of a system [1]. In [19], Morales has studied the concept of shadowing for homeomorphisms from pointwise viewpoint and linked the shadowing with the shadowing at a point. In [9], authors have explored the connection of shadowing with specification of a homeomorphism from pointwise viewpoint and in [15], authors have obtained a necessary and sufficient condition for a point to be a shadowable point of a homeomorphism.

An important consequence of expansivity of a homeomorphism on a compact metric space known as topological stability, was first studied by Walters in [23]. In [18], Lewowicz called a system to be persistent if every orbit of the system can be seen through an actual orbit of every small enough perturbed system. Every topologically stable homeomorphism on a compact manifold is persistent but this need not be true when the phase space is a compact metric space [21, Example 1]. Recently, in [17] authors have studied topological stability from pointwise viewpoint and have proved
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that every shadowable point of an expansive homeomorphism on a compact metric space is topologically stable. In [10], authors have proved that every equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable homeomorphism on a compact metric space is persistent which implies that every equicontinuous topologically stable homeomorphism on a compact metric space is persistent.

In [20], authors have studied shadowing property for finitely generated group actions and in [7], authors have introduced topological stability for such actions and have proved that every expansive finitely generated group action on a compact metric space with shadowing property is topologically stable. In [3], authors have studied \(\alpha\)-persistent and \(\beta\)-persistent finitely generated group actions to study the topological stability of expansive actions on compact metric spaces. The \(\beta\)-persistent property of \(\mathbb{Z}\)-action is equivalent to the persistent property of a homeomorphism corresponding to the positive cyclic generator of \(\mathbb{Z}\). In [16], authors have extended the notion of shadowable points for finitely generated group actions and have proved that the set of all shadowable points of a finitely generated group action on a compact metric space is a Borel subset of the phase space. The study of expansivity, shadowing, topological stability, persistent and their variants have also been explored from global viewpoint for group actions in [4, 8, 11, 14].

This paper is distributed as follows. Section 2 gives necessary preliminaries required for the remaining sections. In Section 3, we introduce topologically stable points for finitely generated group actions and prove that every shadowable point of an expansive finitely generated group action on a compact metric space is topologically stable. We give an example to justify that the expansivity of a finitely generated group action is not a necessary condition to guarantee the topologically stability of a shadowable point of the action. We also give an an example to show that the existence of the dense set of topologically stable points of the finitely generated group action need not imply the topological stability of the action. In Section 4, we relate \(\beta\)-persistent points, \(\beta\)-persistent property and \(\beta\)-persistent measures of finitely generated group actions in order to prove that every equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable action on a compact metric space is \(\beta\)-persistent.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, \(G\) denotes a finitely generated group with a finite symmetric generating set \(S = \{s_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}\), for some \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) i.e. \(S\) is a finite subset of \(G\), \(s \in S\) if and only if \(s^{-1} \in S\) and every element of \(G\) can be expressed as a combination of finitely many elements of \(S\). The number \(|G|\) denotes the cardinality of \(G\) and \((X, d)\) denotes a compact metric space. The set of all non-negative integers (natural numbers respectively) is denoted by \(\mathbb{Z}^+\) (\(\mathbb{N}\) respectively). For each \(k \in \mathbb{Z}^+\), we denote \(G_k = \{g \in G : |g| \leq k\}\), where \(|g|\) denotes the length of \(g\) with respect to the generating set \(S\). We assume that the length of the identity element \(e\) is 0. For a given \(\delta > 0\) and for each \(x \in X\), we denote \(B(x, \delta) = \{y \in X : d(x, y) < \delta\}\) and \(B[x, \delta] = \{y \in X : d(x, y) \leq \delta\}\).
A group action on $X$ with respect to the group $G$ is a continuous map $\Phi : G \times X \to X$ such that:

(i) For each $g \in G$, $\Phi_g(.) = \Phi(g, .)$ is a homeomorphism on $X$.

(ii) For the identity element $e \in G$, $\Phi_e(x) = x$, for each $x \in X$.

(iii) $\Phi_g(\Phi_h(x)) = \Phi_{gh}(x)$, for each pair $g, h \in G$ and for each $x \in X$.

The class of all group actions on $X$ with respect to $G$ is denoted by $\text{Act}(G, X)$. The orbit of a point $x \in X$ under a $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is given by $\mathcal{O}_\Phi(x) = \{ \Phi_g(x) : g \in G \}$.

We define the metric $d_S$ on $\text{Act}(G, X)$, with respect to the generating set $S$ of $G$, by $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) = \sup_{s \in S, x \in X} d(\Phi_s(x), \Psi_s(x))$, for each pair $\Phi, \Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Let $(Y, p)$ be a metric space and let $h : X \to Y$ be a homeomorphism. For each $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$, we define the action $h\Phi h^{-1} \in \text{Act}(G, Y)$ by $(h\Phi h^{-1})_g = h \circ \Phi_g \circ h^{-1}$, for each $g \in G$.

Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then a point $x \in X$ is said to be a periodic point of $\Phi$, if $\mathcal{O}_\Phi(x)$ is finite. The set of all periodic points of $\Phi$ is denoted by $P(\Phi)$. We say that $\Phi$ is minimal, if $\mathcal{O}_\Phi(x)$ is dense in $X$, for each $x \in X$.

An action $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is said to be equicontinuous, if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $d(x, y) < \delta$ implies that $d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(y)) < \epsilon$, for each $g \in G$ and for all $x, y \in X$. We say that $x \in X$ is an equicontinuous point of $\Phi$, if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ depending on $\epsilon$ and $x$ such that $d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(y)) < \epsilon$, for each $g \in G$ and for each $y \in B(x, \delta)$. The set of all equicontinuous points of $\Phi$ is denoted by $E^X(\Phi)$.

Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ and let $\delta > 0$. A map $f : G \to X$ is said to be a $\delta$-pseudo orbit of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) through $B \subseteq X$ ($x \in X$ respectively), if $f(e) \in B$ ($f(e) = x$ respectively) and $d(\Phi_s(f(g)), f(sg)) < \delta$, for each $s \in S$ and for each $g \in G$. On the other hand, $f$ is said to be $\delta$-traced through $\Phi$ by some point $x \in X$, if $d(\Phi_g(x), f(g)) < \delta$, for each $g \in G$. We say that $\Phi$ has shadowing property (with respect to $S$), if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that each $\delta$-pseudo orbit of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) can be $\epsilon$-traced through $\Phi$ by a point of $X$. Recall that the shadowing property of $\Phi$ is independent of the choice of a generator of $G$ [20]. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then we say that $\Phi$ has shadowing if $\Phi$ has shadowing with respect to a symmetric generating set of $G$. A point $x \in X$ is said to be a shadowable point of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) [16], if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that each $\delta$-pseudo orbit of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) through $x$ can be $\epsilon$-traced through $\Phi$ by a point of $X$. The set of all shadowable points of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) is denoted by $\text{Sh}^X_S(\Phi)$. Recall that the set of all shadowable points of $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is independent of the choice of a generator of $G$ and hence it is enough to study $\text{Sh}^X_S(\Phi)$, for some given symmetric generating set $S$ of $G$. We say that a point is a shadowable point of $\Phi$ if it is a shadowable point of $\Phi$ with respect to a symmetric generating set. Recall that if $G = \mathbb{Z}$ is a group of integers, then the notion of shadowing (shadowable point
respectively) of an action $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is equivalent to the notion of shadowing (shadowable point respectively) of the homeomorphism $\Phi_1$ [13].

From [6, Lemma 4.1], we can deduce that if $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a homeomorphism having fixed points only as the end points of the interval, then $f$ has shadowing property.

An action $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is said to be expansive, if there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any pair of distinct points $x, y \in X$, there exists a $g \in G$ such that $d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(y)) > \epsilon$. Such a constant $\epsilon$ is said to be an expansivity constant of $\Phi$.

Let $f$ be a self homeomorphism of $X$. Then a point $x \in X$ is said to be a minimally expansive point of $f$ [13], if there exists an $c > 0$ such that for each $y \in B(x, c)$ and for every pair of distinct points $y_1, y_2 \in \overline{f(y)} = \{f^n(y) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, there exists an $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $d(f^m(y_1), f^m(y_2)) > \epsilon$. Such a constant $c$ is said to be an expansivity constant for minimal expansivity of $f$ at $x$. The set of all minimally expansive points of $f$ is denoted by $M_f(X)$. Recall that every minimally expansive shadowable point of a self homeomorphism of a compact metric space is topologically stable [13, Theorem 2.7].

Let $f$ be a self homeomorphism of $(X, d)$. Then a point $x \in X$ is said to be a topologically stable point of $f$, if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every self homeomorphism $g$ of $X$ satisfying $\sup_{x \in X} d(f(x), g(x)) \leq \delta$, there exists a continuous map $h : \overline{g(x)} \rightarrow X$ such that $f \circ h = h \circ g$ and $d(h(z), z) \leq \epsilon$, for each $z \in \overline{g(x)}$ [17].

An action $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is said to be topologically stable (with respect to $S$), if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for each $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$, there exists a continuous map $h : X \rightarrow X$ such that $\Phi_g \circ h = h \circ \Psi_g$, for each $g \in G$ and $d(h(x), x) < \epsilon$, for each $x \in X$. Recall that the topological stability of $\Phi$ is independent of the choice of a generator of $G$ [7]. We say that $\Phi$ is topologically stable if $\Phi$ is topologically stable with respect to some symmetric generating set of $G$.

Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then $\Phi$ is said to be $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$) through a subset $A \subseteq X$, if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for each $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta$ and for each $x \in A$, there exists a $y \in X$ such that $d(\Phi_g(x), \Psi_g(y)) \leq \epsilon$, for each $g \in G$. Recall that the $\beta$-persistence of $\Phi$ is independent of the choice of generating set [8]. We say that $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent if $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent with respect to some symmetric generating set of $G$.

A Borel probability measure $\mu$ is a $\sigma$-additive measure defined on the Borel $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{B}(X)$ of $X$ such that $\mu(X) = 1$. The set of all Borel probability measures on $X$ is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and it is assumed to be equipped with the weak* topology. We say that $\mu$ is supported on a subset $B$ of $X$, if $\text{Supp}(\mu) \subseteq B$. We denote the Dirac measure supported on $x \in X$ by $m_x$, i.e. $m_x(A) = 0$, if $x \notin A$ and $m_x(A) = 1$, if $x \in A$. 


3. Pointwise Topological Stability

In this section, we introduce topologically stable point of a group action and prove that the set of all topologically stable points is independent of the choice of a generating set of the group. Further, we prove a pointwise version of stability theorem of Walters. Firstly, we introduce the notion of topologically stable point of actions which extends the notion of topologically stable point of homeomorphisms [10].

**Definition 3.1.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then a point $x \in X$ is said to be a topologically stable point of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for each $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$, there exists a continuous map $h : O_\Psi(x) \to X$ such that $\Phi g \circ h = h \circ \Psi g$, for each $g \in G$ and $d(h(y), y) < \epsilon$, for each $y \in O_\Psi(x)$. The set of all topologically stable points of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) is denoted by $T^X_S(\Phi)$.

**Remark 3.2.** From the corresponding definitions, it is easy to check that every point of the phase space under a topologically stable action is a topologically stable point. We don't know whether the converse of the last statement is true or not but we know that there exists a non-topologically stable action having dense set of topologically stable points (see Example 3.11).

**Remark 3.3.** If $G = \mathbb{Z}$, then the notion of topologically stable point of $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is equivalent to the notion of topologically stable point of the homeomorphism $\Phi_1$.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then $T^X_S(\Phi) = T^X_{S'}(\Phi)$, for every pair of generating sets $S$ and $S'$ of $G$.

**Proof.** Let $x \in T^X_S(\Phi)$. For a given $\epsilon > 0$, choose a $\delta > 0$ by topological stability of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) at $x$. Since $\Phi_g$ is uniformly continuous, for each $g \in G$, we can choose an $\eta > 0$ such that $d_{S'}(\Phi, \Psi) < \eta$ implies that $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$, for each $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Now, the proof follows from the fact that the existence of a continuous map to guarantee the topological stability of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S'$) at $x$ does not depend on the choice of a generator of $G$. \[\square\]

From Proposition 3.4, we get that the topological stability of a point of an action $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ is independent of the choice of a generator of $G$. We say that a point is a topologically stable point of $\Phi$ if it is a topologically stable point of $\Phi$ with respect to some symmetric generating set of $G$.

Following Example 3.5 shows the existence of a group action having non-empty set of topologically stable points. Therefore it is obvious to ask that when we can guarantee the existence of topologically stable points of a group action. We provide one such condition in the Theorem 3.9 of this section but before that we will explore some properties of such points.

**Example 3.5.** Let $g$ be a homeomorphism on an uncountable compact metric space $(Y, d_0)$. Let $p$ be a periodic point of $g$ with prime period $t \geq 1$. Let $X = Y \cup E$, where $E$ is an infinite enumerable set. Set $Q = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{1, 2, 3\} \times \{k\} \times \{0, 1, 2, 3, ..., t-1\}$.
Suppose that \( r : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow E \) and \( s : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \) are bijections. Consider the bijection \( q : Q \rightarrow E \) defined as \( q(i, k, j) = r(s(i, k, j)) \), for each \( (i, k, j) \in Q \). Therefore any point \( x \in E \) has the form \( x = q(i, k, j) \), for some \( (i, k, j) \in Q \).

Consider the function \( d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \) defined by

\[
d(a, b) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } a = b, \\
\frac{1}{k} + d_0(a, b) & \text{if } a = q(i, k, j) \text{ and } b \in Y \\
\frac{1}{k} + d_0(a, q^j(p)) & \text{if } a \in Y \text{ and } b = q(i, k, j) \\
\frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{m} + d_0(g^j(p), g^r(p)) & \text{if } a = q(i, k, j), b = q(i, m, r) \text{ and } k \neq m \text{ or } j \neq r
\end{cases}
\]

and \( f : X \rightarrow X \) defined by

\[
f(x) = \begin{cases} 
g(x) & \text{if } x \in Y \\
q(i, k, (j + 1)) \mod t & \text{if } x = q(i, k, j).
\end{cases}
\]

Following steps as in [2] (on Page 3742-3743), we get that \((X, d)\) is the compact metric space and \( f \) is the homeomorphism. Now, consider the integral Heisenberg group \( H = \langle a, b, c | ac = ca, bc = cb, ab = bac \rangle \). For every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( x, y \in SL(n, \mathbb{Z}) \) be such that \( xy = yx \). Set,

\[
a = \begin{bmatrix} x & I_n & 0 \\
0 & x & 0 \\
0 & 0 & x \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} y & 0 & 0 \\
0 & y & I_n \\
0 & 0 & y \end{bmatrix}, \quad c = \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 & x^{-1}y^{-1} \\
0 & I_n & 0 \\
0 & 0 & I_n \end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( I_n \) denotes the identity matrix of order \( n \times n \). Clearly, \( a, b, c \) satisfy the relations of \( H \) and \( H \) is a subgroup of \( SL(3n, \mathbb{Z}) \). Now define the action \( \Phi \in \text{Act}(H, X) \) as follows: \( \Phi_a(x) = f(x) \), \( \Phi_b(x) = x \) and \( \Phi_c(x) = x \), for each \( x \in X \). Clearly, every point of \( E \) is an isolated point of \( X \). Choose, \( z = q(i, k, j) \in E \) and \( \epsilon < \frac{1}{k} \). Let \( \delta = \epsilon \) and \( \Psi \in \text{Act}(H, X) \) be such that \( d_S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta \), where \( S \) is the symmetric generating set containing \( a^i, b, c \) and \( -t \leq i \leq t \). Since \( B_d(f^i(z), \epsilon) = \{ f^i(z) \} \), for all \( -t \leq i \leq t \), we get that \( \Phi_g(z) = \Psi_g(z) \), for each \( g \in H \) and \( O_{\Psi}(z) = \{ z, f(z), \ldots, f^{t-1}(z) \} \). Define \( h : O_{\Psi}(z) \rightarrow X \) such that \( h(\Psi_g(z)) = \Phi_g(z) \), for each \( g \in H \). Clearly, \( h \) is a well defined continuous map such that \( \Phi \circ h = h \circ \Psi \) and \( d(h(x), x) < \epsilon \), for each \( x \in O_{\Psi}(z) \). From Proposition 3.4, we get that \( z \) is a topologically stable point of \( \Phi \).

**Proposition 3.6.** Let \( \Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X) \). Then \( T^X_S(H\Phi H^{-1}) = H(T^X_S(\Phi)) \), for each homeomorphism \( H : X \rightarrow Y \).

**Proof.** Let \( x \in T^X_S(\Phi) \). For a given \( \epsilon > 0 \), choose an \( \eta > 0 \) by uniform continuity of \( H \). For this \( \eta \), choose a \( \delta > 0 \) by topological stability of \( \Phi \) (with respect to \( S \)) at \( x \). For this \( \delta \), choose a \( \gamma > 0 \) by uniform continuity of \( H^{-1} \). Choose a \( \Psi \in \text{Act}(G, Y) \) such that \( \overline{d}_S(H\Phi H^{-1}, \Psi) < \gamma \). Clearly, \( \overline{d}_S(\Phi, \Psi H) < \delta \) and hence there exists a continuous map \( h : \overline{O}_{H^{-1}}(\Psi H)(x) \rightarrow X \) by topological stability of \( \Phi \) (with respect
Proposition 3.7. Let $S$ to $CL$ \Let $\Phi$ be a well-defined continuous map such that in the last inclusion to complete the proof.

Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. We denote $CL^X_S(\Phi) = \{x \in X : \text{for each } \epsilon > 0, \text{there exists an } \Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X) \text{ such that } d_S(\Phi, \Psi) < \epsilon \text{ and } x \in P(\Psi)\}$. It is easy to check that $CL^X_S(\Phi)$ is independent of the choice of a generator of $G$.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then the following statements are true:

1. $CL^X_S(\Phi) \cap T^X_S(\Phi) \subseteq \overline{P(\Phi)}$.
2. If $X$ is an infinite metric space and $\Phi$ is minimal, then $CL^X_S(\Phi) \cap T^X_S(\Phi) = \phi$.
3. If $X$ is an infinite metric space and $\Phi$ can be approximated by minimal actions, then $\overline{(P(\Phi)^{\circ})} \cap T^X_S(\Phi) = \phi$.

**Proof.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then,

1. Choose an $x \in CL^X_S(\Phi) \cap T^X_S(\Phi)$. For a given $\epsilon > 0$, choose a $\delta > 0$ by topological stability of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) at $x$. Since $x \in CL^X_S(\Phi)$, choose a $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$ and $x \in P(\Psi)$. Fix a continuous map $h : \overline{\Phi(F)} \to X$ such that $\Phi_g h = h \Phi_g$, for each $g \in G$ and $d(h(y), y) < \epsilon$, for each $y \in \overline{\Phi(F)}$. Since $x \in P(\Psi)$, we get that $\Phi(x)$ is a finite subset of $X$ and hence $h(\Phi(x))$ is a finite subset of $X$ implying that $\Phi(h(x))$ is a finite subset of $X$. Since $d(h(x), x) < \epsilon$, we get a periodic point of $\Phi$ in $B(x, \epsilon)$. Since $\epsilon$ is chosen arbitrarily, we get that $x \in \overline{P(\Phi)}$ which completes the proof.

2. If $X$ is an infinite metric space and $\Phi$ is minimal, then $P(\Phi) = \phi$ and hence from (i), we get that $CL^X_S(\Phi) \cap T^X_S(\Phi) = \phi$.

3. On the contrary, assume that there exists an $x \in (P(\Phi)^{\circ}) \cap T^X_S(\Phi)$. Choose an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B(x, \epsilon) \subseteq P(\Phi)$. For this $\epsilon$, choose a $\delta > 0$ by topological stability of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) at $x$. For this $\delta$, choose a minimal action $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ such that $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$. Choose a continuous map $h : \overline{\Phi(F)} \to X$ such that $\Phi_g h = h \Phi_g$, for each $g \in G$ and $d(h(y), y) < \epsilon$, for each $y \in \overline{\Phi(F)}$. Since $\Phi(h(x)) = h(\Phi(x))$, $\Phi(x)$ is dense in $X$ and $h$ is continuous, we get that $\Phi(h(x))$ is dense in $X$. Since $d(h(x), x) < \epsilon$, we get that $h(x) \in P(\Phi)$ implying that $X$ is a finite metric space which is a contradiction to our assumption and hence $(P(\Phi)^{\circ}) \cap T^X_S(\Phi) = \phi$.

Lemma 3.8. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ be expansive with an expansivity constant $c$. Then, for each $x \in X$ and for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $N = N(\epsilon, x) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\sup_{g \in G_N} d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(x')) \leq \epsilon$ implies that $d(x, x') < \epsilon$.

**Proof.** On the contrary, assume that there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for each $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there exists an $x_N' \in X$ satisfying $\sup_{g \in G_N} d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(x'_N)) \leq \epsilon$ and $d(x, x'_N) \geq \epsilon$. Since
$X$ is a compact metric space, we can assume that $x' \to x'$, for some $x' \in X$. Since $G = \bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{Z}^+} G_N$, we get that $d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(x')) \leq c$, for each $g \in G$ and $d(x, x') \geq \epsilon$, which contradicts the expansivity of $\Phi$. \hfill \Box

**Theorem 3.9.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ be expansive with expansivity constant $c$. Then every shadowable point of $\Phi$ is a topologically stable point of $\Phi$.

**Proof.** Let $x \in S h_{S}^{N}(\Phi)$. We claim that $x \in T_{S}^{N}(\Phi)$. For a given $\epsilon > 0$ and for $\eta = \frac{\min\{\epsilon, c\}}{8}$, choose $0 < \delta < \eta$ by shadowing property of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) through $x$. Choose a $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $d_{S}(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$. Note that $d(\Phi_{s}(\Psi_{g}(x)), \Psi_{sg}(x)) = d(\Phi_{s}(\Psi_{g}(x)), \Psi_{s}(\Psi_{g}(x))) < \delta$, for each $s \in S$ and for each $g \in G$. Therefore the map $f : G \to X$ defined by $f(g) = \Psi_{g}(x)$, for each $g \in G$, forms a $\delta$-pseudo orbit of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) through $x$. By shadowing property of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) through $x$, choose and fix $y \in B(x, \eta)$ satisfying $d(\Phi_{g}(y), \Psi_{g}(x)) < \eta$, for each $g \in G$. Define $h : \mathcal{O}_{\Psi}(x) \to X$ by $h(\Psi_{g}(x)) = \Phi_{g}(y)$, for each $g \in G$.

To check that $h$ is well defined, choose $g_{1}, g_{2} \in G$ such that $\Psi_{g_{1}}(x) = \Psi_{g_{2}}(x)$. Then $\Psi_{g_{3}g_{1}}(x) = \Psi_{g_{3}g_{2}}(x)$, for each $g_{3} \in G$ and hence,

$$
\begin{align*}
&d(\Phi_{g_{3}}(\Phi_{g_{1}}(y)), \Phi_{g_{3}}(\Phi_{g_{2}}(y))) \\
&\quad \leq d(\Phi_{g_{3}g_{1}}(y), \Psi_{g_{3}g_{1}}(x)) + d(\Psi_{g_{3}g_{1}}(x), \Psi_{g_{3}g_{2}}(x)) \\
&\quad \quad + d(\Psi_{g_{3}g_{2}}(x), \Phi_{g_{3}g_{2}}(y)) \\
&\quad = d(\Phi_{g_{3}g_{1}}(y), \Psi_{g_{3}g_{1}}(x)) + d(\Psi_{g_{3}g_{2}}(x), \Phi_{g_{3}g_{2}}(y)) \\
&\quad \leq 2\eta \\
&\quad < c, \text{ for each } g_{3} \in G.
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\Phi$ is expansive with expansivity constant $c$, we get that $\Phi_{g_{1}}(y) = \Phi_{g_{2}}(y)$ implying that $h$ is well defined. Moreover,

$$
(\Phi_{s} \circ h)(\Psi_{g}(x)) = \Phi_{s} \circ (\Phi_{g}(y)) = \Phi_{sg}(y)
$$

$$
= h(\Psi_{sg}(x)) = h(\Psi_{s}(\Psi_{g}(x)))
$$

$$
= (h \circ \Psi_{s})(\Psi_{g}(x)), \text{ for each } s \in S \text{ and for each } g \in G.
$$

Therefore $\Phi_{g} \circ h(z) = h \circ \Psi_{g}(z)$, for each $z \in \mathcal{O}_{\Psi}(x)$. Also, $d(h(\Psi_{g}(x)), \Psi_{g}(x)) < \eta$, for each $g \in G$ implying that $d(h(z), z) < \eta$, for each $z \in \mathcal{O}_{\Psi}(x)$.

Now, we claim that $h$ is uniformly continuous. For the $y$ as above and $0 < \epsilon < c$, choose an $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ from Lemma 3.8. Choose $0 < \gamma < \epsilon$ such that $d(u, v) < \gamma$ implies that $d(\Psi_{g}(u), \Psi_{g}(v)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, for each $g \in G_{N}$ and for each pair $u, v \in X$. Therefore for each pair $u, v \in \mathcal{O}_{\Psi}(x)$ satisfying $d(u, v) < \gamma$, we have,

$$
\begin{align*}
&d(\Phi_{g}(h(u)), \Phi_{g}(h(v))) = d(\Psi_{g}(u), h(\Psi_{g}(v))) \\
&\quad \leq d(\Psi_{g}(u), \Psi_{g}(v)) + d(\Psi_{g}(v), h(\Psi_{g}(v))) \\
&\quad \leq 2\eta + \frac{c}{2} \\
&\quad < c, \text{ for each } g \in G_{N}.
\end{align*}
$$
Therefore \( d(h(u), h(v)) < \epsilon \). Since \( u \) and \( v \) are chosen arbitrarily, we get that \( h \) is uniformly continuous. Since \( X \) is a compact metric space, we can extend \( h \) continuously to a function \( \overline{h} : \overline{O}_\Phi(x) \rightarrow X \) such that \( \Phi \circ \overline{h} = \overline{h} \circ \Psi \) and \( d(\overline{h}(z), z) < \epsilon \), for each \( z \in \overline{O}_\Phi(x) \), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

Following Example 3.10 justifies that the expansivity of an action to guarantee the topological stability of a shadowable point of that action in Theorem 3.9 is sufficient but not necessary. In the next Example 3.11 we provide a non-topologically stable action having dense set of topologically stable points which justifies that the existence of the dense set of topologically stable points need not imply the topological stability of that action.

Example 3.10. Consider the homeomorphism \( f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \) defined as follows:

\[
\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= \begin{cases} 
\frac{3}{2}x & \text{if } x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\
\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1].
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\]

We assume that \([0, 1]\) is equipped with the usual metric. We observe that \( d(f(\frac{3}{4}), \frac{3}{4}) \leq d(f(y_2), y_2) \leq d(f(y_1), y_1) \leq d(f(\frac{1}{4}), \frac{1}{4}) \) for each pair \( y_1, y_2 \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}] \) whenever \( y_1 \leq y_2 \). Also, \( \overline{O}_f(y) = \overline{O}_f(y) \cup \{0, 1\} \) and \( \overline{O}_f(y) \cap [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}] \neq \phi \), for each \( y \in (0, 1) \). Since \( f \) is a strictly increasing homeomorphism, we conclude that \( M_f([0, 1]) = [0, 1] \). From [6, Lemma 4.1], we get that \( f \) has shadowing property and hence from [13, Theorem 2.7], we get that every point of \([0, 1]\) is a topologically stable point of \( f \). Define the action \( \Phi \in \text{Act}(\mathbb{Z}, [0, 1]) \) by \( \Phi_1(x) = f(x) \), for each \( x \in [0, 1] \). From Remark 3.3, we get that \( \Phi \) is the pointwise topologically stable action. Clearly, \( \Phi \) is not an expansive action implying that \( \Phi \) is the non-expansive pointwise topologically stable action with shadowing property. Therefore the expansivity of an action is not a necessary condition for the topological stability of a shadowable point of that action.

Example 3.11. [24, Theorem 2] Consider the homeomorphism \( f_0 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \) defined as follows:

\[
\begin{aligned}
f_0(x) &= \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{2}x & \text{if } x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\
\frac{3}{2}x - \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } x \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}] \\
\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } x \in [\frac{3}{4}, 1],
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\]

where \([0, 1]\) is equipped with the usual metric. Set \( p_n = \frac{1}{2^n} \) and \( p_{-n} = 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} \), for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \( X = [0, 1]/ \sim \) be the quotient space of \([0, 1]\) by the relation “ \( \sim \) ” defined as \( x \sim y \) if and only if either \( x = y \) or \( x, y \in \{0, 1\} \). Consider the homeomorphism \( f \) on \( X \) defined as follows:
In [24 Theorem 2], Yano proved that $f$ has shadowing property and $f$ is not topologically stable. Using similar arguments as in Example 3.10, we observe that $X$ is a topologically stable point of $\Phi_1$ if $\Phi$ is topologically stable. Therefore the density of the set of all topologically stable points of an action need not imply the topological stability of that action. Therefore the density of the set of all topologically stable points 

\[ f(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\
p_{n+1} + \left(\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\right)f_0(2^{n+1}(x - p_{n+1})) & \text{if } x \in [p_{n+1}, p_n]. \\
p_{-n} + \left(\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\right)f_0(2^{n+1}(x - p_{-n})) & \text{if } x \in [p_{-n}, p_{-n-1}]. 
\end{cases} \]

Moreover, $\Phi(x) = f(x)$, for each $x \in X$. From Remark 3.3 we get that $\Phi$ has dense set of topologically stable points but $\Phi$ is not topologically stable. Recall that the unit circle $S^1$ and $X$ are homeomorphic metric spaces. Since topological stability and shadowing property of an action are invariant under conjugacy, from Proposition 3.6 we get that $\Phi$ will generate a non-topologically stable action on the unit circle having dense set of topologically stable points.

4. $\beta$-Persistence and Pointwise Topological Stability

In this section, we introduce the notion of $\beta$-persistent points and $\beta$-persistent measures of finitely generated group actions. We prove that every equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable action on a compact metric space is $\beta$-persistent.

Definition 4.1. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then a point $x \in X$ is said to be a $\beta$-persistent point of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$), if $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$) through $\{x\}$. The set of all $\beta$-persistent points of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) is denoted by $\text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)$. We say that $\Phi$ is pointwise $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$), if $\text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi) = X$.

Remark 4.2. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ and $(Y, p)$ be a metric space. Then the definition of $\beta$-persistent points of $\Phi$ is independent of the choice of a generator of $G$. Moreover, $\text{Pe}_S^X(H\Phi H^{-1}) = H(\text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi))$, for a homeomorphism $H : X \to Y$.

Let $\Phi, \Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then for each $\epsilon > 0$ and for each $x \in X$, we denote $\Gamma_\epsilon^x(\Phi, \Psi) = \bigcap_{g \in G} \Psi_{g^{-1}}(B[\Phi_g(x), \epsilon]) = \{y \in X : d(\Phi_g(x), \Psi_g(y)) \leq \epsilon, \text{ for each } g \in G\}$. We define $B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi) = \{x \in X : \Gamma_\epsilon^x(\Phi, \Psi) \neq \emptyset\}$.

Lemma 4.3. Let $\Phi, \Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then $B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)$ is a compact subset of $X$, for each $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. Since $X$ is compact, it is sufficient to show that $B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)$ is a closed subset of $X$, for each $\epsilon > 0$. Fix an $\epsilon > 0$ and choose a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)$ such that $x_i \to x$, for some $x \in X$. Then there exists a sequence $\{y_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $X$ such that $d(\Phi_g(x_i), \Psi_g(y_i)) \leq \epsilon$, for each $g \in G$ and for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $X$ is a compact metric space, we can assume that $y_i \to y$, for some $y \in X$. Note that $y \in \Gamma_\epsilon^x(\Phi, \Psi)$ and hence $x \in B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)$ implying that $B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)$ is a closed subset of $X$. \(\square\)
Proposition 4.4. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then $\text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)$ is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$-subset of $X$ and hence measurable.

Proof. For each pair $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, we define $C(\epsilon, \delta) = \{x \in X : \Gamma_\epsilon^x(\Phi, \Psi) = \phi, \text{ for some } \Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X) \text{ satisfying } \overline{d}_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta \}$. Note that $X \setminus \text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} C(m^{-1}, n^{-1})$. From Lemma 4.3, we get that $C(m^{-1}, n^{-1})$ is an open subset of $X$, for each pair $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ implying that $X \setminus \text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)$ is a $G_{\delta\sigma}$-subset of $X$ and hence $\text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)$ is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$-subset of $X$. \hfill \Box

Definition 4.5. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ is said to be $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$), if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\mu(B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)) = 1$, for each $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $\overline{d}_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta$. The set of all $\beta$-persistent measures (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$) is denoted by $M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)$.

Definition 4.6. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ is said to be $\beta$-almost persistent (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$), if $\mu(\text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)) = 1$. The set of all $\beta$-almost persistent measures (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$) is denoted by $M_{\text{APE}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)$.

Remark 4.7. The notions of $\beta$-persistent measures and $\beta$-almost persistent measures of finitely generated group actions are independent of the choice of a generator of the group.

Proposition 4.8. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then the following statements are true:

1. $\text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi) = \{x \in X : m_x \in M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)\}$.
2. If $\{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k\} \subseteq M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_k \in (0, 1]$ satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i = 1$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i \mu_i \in M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)$.

Proof. We proceed as follows:

1. Note that if $x \in \text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)$, then $\text{Supp}(m_x) = \{x\} \subseteq \text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)$ implying that $m_x \in M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)$. Conversely, choose an $m_x \in M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)$, for some $x \in X$. For a given $\epsilon > 0$, choose a $\delta > 0$ such that $m_x(B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)) = 1$ whenever $\overline{d}_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta$ by $\beta$-persistence of $m_x$ (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$). Since $x \in B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)$ and $\epsilon$ is chosen arbitrarily, we get that $x \in \text{Pe}_S^X(\Phi)$.

2. Set $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i \mu_i$. For a given $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k > 0$ by definition of $\beta$-persistent measure of $\Phi$. Set $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k\}$. Note that $\mu(B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i \mu_i(B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i = 1$ whenever $\overline{d}_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta$. Since $\epsilon$ is chosen arbitrarily, we get that $\mu \in M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi)$. \hfill \Box

Lemma 4.9. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. Then $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$) if and only if $M_{\text{Pe}}^{(S,X)}(\Phi) = \mathcal{M}(X)$.

Proof. Note that if $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$), then for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ and a Borelian $B \subseteq X$ with $\mu(B) = 1$ such that for each $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ with $\overline{d}_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta$ and for each $x \in B$, there exists
Let $x \in X$ such that $d(\Phi_g(x), \Psi_g(y)) \leq \epsilon$, for each $g \in G$ and hence $\mu \in M^{(S,X)}_c(\Phi)$, for each $\mu \in M(X)$. Conversely, suppose that $M^{(S,X)}_c(\Phi) = M(X)$ but $\Phi$ is not $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$). Therefore there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, a sequence of actions \( \{\Psi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \text{Act}(G, X) \) and a sequence \( \{x_i\} \subseteq X \) such that $d_S(\Phi, \Psi_i) \leq \frac{1}{2^i}$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Gamma^\epsilon_i(\Phi, \Psi_i) = \phi$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{x_i}}{2^i}$. For the above $\epsilon$, choose a $\delta > 0$ by $\beta$-persistent property of $\mu$ (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$). Choose a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{k} < \delta$. Then there exists a Borelian $B_k$ with $\mu(B_k) = 1$ such that $\Gamma^\epsilon_k(\Phi, \Psi_k) \neq \phi$, for each $y \in B_k$. Since $\mu(B_k) = 1$, we get that $m_{x_k}(B_k) = 1$ implying that $x_k \in B_k$. Therefore we get that $\Gamma^\epsilon_k(\Phi, \Psi_k) \neq \phi$, which is a contradiction.

**Proposition 4.10.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ then $M^{(S,X)}_c(\Phi)$ is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ subset of $M(X)$.

**Proof.** For a given $\epsilon > 0$ and a $\delta > 0$, we denote $C(\epsilon, \delta) = \{\mu \in M(X) : \mu(B(\epsilon, \Phi, \Psi)) < 1, \text{ for some } \Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X) \}$ with $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta \}$. Note that $C(\epsilon, \delta)$ is an open subset of $M(X)$, for each pair $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and $M(X) \setminus M^{(S,X)}_c(\Phi) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} C(m^{-1}, n^{-1})$. Therefore $M(X) \setminus M^{(S,X)}_c(\Phi)$ is a $G_{\delta\sigma}$ subset of $M(X)$ and hence $M^{(S,X)}_c(\Phi)$ is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ subset of $M(X)$.

**Lemma 4.11.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. If $X$ has no isolated points, then $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$) if and only if every non-atomic Borel probability measure on $X$ is a $\beta$-persistent measure (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$).

**Proof.** Forward part follows from Lemma 4.9 Conversely, suppose that every non-atomic Borel probability measure on $X$ is a $\beta$-persistent measure (with respect to $\Phi$ and $S$) but $\Phi$ is not $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$). Therefore there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, a sequence of actions \( \{\Psi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \text{Act}(G, X) \) and a sequence \( \{x_i\} \subseteq X \) such that $d_S(\Phi, \Psi_i) \leq \frac{1}{2^i}$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Gamma^\epsilon_i(\Phi, \Psi_i) = \phi$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall that if $X$ is a compact metric space without isolated points, then for each $x \in X$ and for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a non-atomic Borel probability measure $\nu$ such that $x \in \text{supp}(\nu) \subseteq B[x, \epsilon]$. Choose a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{k} < \delta$, then there exists a $\nu \in \text{supp}(\mu_i)$ such that $x_i \in B[x, \epsilon]$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_i}{2^i}$. Now, one can complete the proof by similar arguments as given in the proof of Lemma 4.9

**Lemma 4.12.** Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. If $\Phi$ is equicontinuous, then $P e^X_S(\Phi)$ is a closed subset of $X$.

**Proof.** Let \( \{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence of $\beta$-persistent points (with respect to $S$) converging to some $x \in X$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. For $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$, choose an $\eta > 0$ by the equicontinuity of $\Phi$. Choose a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(x, x_k) < \eta$. Therefore $d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(x_k)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, for each $g \in G$. For $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$, choose a $\delta > 0$ from $\beta$-persistence of $x_k$ (with respect to $S$). Hence if given $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfies $d_S(\Phi, \Psi) \leq \delta$, then there exists a $y \in X$ such that $d(\Phi_g(x_k), \Psi_g(y)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ implying that $d(\Phi_g(x), \Psi_g(y)) \leq \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon$ is chosen arbitrarily, we get that $x$ is a $\beta$-persistent point of $X$ (with respect to $S$).

\[\square\]
Lemma 4.13. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ be an equicontinuous action. Then $M^{(S,X)}_{\text{APe}}(\Phi) \subseteq M^{(S,X)}_{\text{Pe}}(\Phi)$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mu \in M^{(S,X)}_{\text{APe}}(\Phi) \setminus M^{(S,X)}_{\text{Pe}}(\Phi)$. Then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, a sequence $\{\Psi^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $d^S(\Phi, \Psi^i) \leq \frac{1}{i}$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $\{B_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$ of positive measurable sets such that $\Gamma^S(\Phi, \Psi_i) = \emptyset$, for each $z \in B_i$ and for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $(B_i \cap \text{supp}(\mu)) \neq \emptyset$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\mu \in M^{(S,X)}_{\text{APe}}(\Phi)$ and $\Phi$ is equicontinuous, from Lemma 4.12, we get that $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq P e^X_2(\Phi) = P e^X(\Phi)$ implying that $(B_i \cap \text{supp}(\mu)) \subseteq (B_i \cap P e^X_2(\Phi)) = \emptyset$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore by compactness of $X$ and from Lemma 4.12 we can choose a sequence $\{x_i \in B_i \cap P e^X_2(\Phi)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to some $x \in P e^X_2(\Phi)$. For $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$, choose a $\delta > 0$, by the equicontinuity of $\Phi$ and $\beta$-persistent property of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) through $\{x\}$. Choose a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\max\{d(x, x_k), d^S(\Phi, \Psi^k)\} < \delta$. Therefore $d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi^k_g(x_k)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, for each $g \in G$ and $d(\Phi_g(x), \Psi^k_g(y)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, for each $g \in G$ and for some $y \in X$. Hence $d(\Phi_g(x_k), \Psi^k_g(y)) \leq \epsilon$, for each $g \in G$ implying that $y \in \Gamma^X_{\epsilon_k}(\Phi, \Psi^k)$. Since $x_k \in B_k$, we get a contradiction and hence $\mu \in M^{(S,X)}_{\text{Pe}}(\Phi)$.

Theorem 4.14. Let $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$. If $\Phi$ is an equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable action (with respect to $S$), then $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$).

Proof. First, we claim that every equicontinuous topologically stable point of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) is a $\beta$-persistent point (with respect to $S$). Choose an $x \in E^X(\Phi) \cap T^X_2(\Phi)$ and an $\epsilon > 0$. For $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$, choose an $\eta > 0$ by the equicontinuity of $\Phi$ at $x$. For $\eta$, choose a $\delta > 0$ by topological stability of $\Phi$ (with respect to $S$) at $x$. Choose a $\Psi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ satisfying $d^S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$. Therefore there exists a continuous map $h : \overline{\mathcal{O}}_{\Psi}(x) \to X$ such that $\Phi_g \circ h = h \circ \Phi_g$, for each $g \in G$ and $d(h(z), z) < \delta$, for each $z \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_{\Psi}(x)$. Therefore $d(h(x), x) < \delta$ and hence $d(\Phi_g(h(x)), \Phi_g(x)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, for each $g \in G$. Hence $d(\Phi_g(x), \Psi_g(x)) \leq d(\Phi_g(x), \Phi_g(h(x))) + d(h(\Psi_g(x)), \Psi_g(x)) < \epsilon$, for each $g \in G$. Since $\epsilon$ is chosen arbitrarily, we get that $x \in P e^X(\Phi)$. Since $\Phi$ is an equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable action (with respect to $S$), our last claim proves that $E^X(\Phi) = T^X_2(\Phi) = P e^X(\Phi) = X$ implying that $\Phi$ is pointwise $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$) and hence $M^{(S,X)}_{\text{APe}}(\Phi) = \mathcal{M}(X)$. From Lemma 4.13 and Lemma 4.19 we get that $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent (with respect to $S$).

Example 4.15. Let $g$ be an equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable homeomorphism on an uncountable perfect compact metric space $(Y, d_0)$ [12]. Let $p$ be a periodic point of $g$ with prime period $t \geq 1$. Define the compact metric space $(X, d)$ and the homeomorphism $f$ on $X$ as in Example 3.5. Note that $x \in X$ is an isolated point of $X$ if and only if $x \in E$. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}$ be the group of integers and let $S$ be the symmetric generating set of $G$ containing $\{i : -t \leq i \leq t\}$. Now, define the action $\Phi \in \text{Act}(G, X)$ as follows: $\Phi_1(x) = f(x)$, for each $x \in X$. Since $g$ is equicontinuous homeomorphism, we get that $f$ is equicontinuous homeomorphism and hence $\Phi$ is equicontinuous action. Following steps as in Example 3.5, we get that every point of $E$ is a topologically stable point of $\Phi$. Now, choose a $y \in Y$ and an $\epsilon > 0$. For $\epsilon$, choose a $\delta > 0$ by topological stability of point $y$ under $g$. Suppose that $\overline{\mathcal{O}}^S(\Phi, \Psi) < \delta$. Since $Y$ has no isolated
points, we have $\Psi_1(Y) = Y$ and hence $\overline{O_\Psi(y)} = \overline{O_{\Psi_1}(y)} \subseteq Y$. Therefore we can choose a continuous map $h : \overline{O_\Psi(y)} \to X$ such that $\Phi \circ h = h \circ \Psi$ and $d(h(z), z) < \epsilon$, for each $z \in \overline{O_\Psi(y)}$. Since $y$ is chosen arbitrarily, we get that every point of $Y$ is also a topologically stable point of $\Phi$ implying that $\Phi$ is an equicontinuous pointwise topologically stable action. From Theorem 4.14, we get that $\Phi$ is $\beta$-persistent.
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