

EQUICONTINUITY OF MINIMAL SETS FOR AMENABLE GROUP ACTIONS ON DENDRITES

ENHUI SHI & XIANGDONG YE

ABSTRACT. In this note, we show that if G is an amenable group acting on a dendrite X , then the restriction of G to any minimal set K is equicontinuous, and K is either finite or homeomorphic to the Cantor set.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that if G is a group and X is a compact metric space, then every continuous action of G on X must have a minimal set K . A natural question is what can we say about the topology of K and the dynamics of the subsystem (K, G) . Certainly, the answer to this question depends on the topology of X and the algebraic structure of G .

In the case of orientation preserving group actions on the circle \mathbb{S}^1 , the topology of minimal sets and the dynamics on them are well understood. In fact, for any action of group G on \mathbb{S}^1 , the minimal sets K can only be a finite set, or a Cantor set, or the whole circle (see e.g. [12]); if K is a Cantor set, then (K, G) is semiconjugate to a minimal action on \mathbb{S}^1 ; if $K = \mathbb{S}^1$, then (K, G) is either equicontinuous or strongly proximal, and if (K, G) is strongly proximal, G cannot be amenable (see [7]). The topological conjugation classes of minimal group actions on the circle are classified by Ghys using bounded Euler class (see [4]).

Recently, there is a considerable progress in studying group actions on dendrites. Minimal group actions on dendrites appear naturally in the theory of 3-dimensional hyperbolic geometry (see e.g. [2, 9]). Shi proved that every minimal group action on dendrites is strongly proximal and the acting group cannot be amenable (see [14, 15]). Based on the results obtained by Marzougui and Naghmouchi in [8], Shi and Ye showed that every amenable group action on dendrites always has a minimal set consisting of 1 or 2 points (see [16]), which is also implied by the work of Malyutin and Duchesne-Monod (see [6, 3]). Glasner and Megrelishvili showed the extreme proximality of minimal subsystems provided that the group actions on dendrites have no finite orbits (see [5]). For \mathbb{Z} actions on dendrites, Naghmouchi proved that every minimal set is either finite or an adding machine (see [11]).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54H20, 37B25, 37B05, 37B40.

Key words and phrases. Equicontinuity, amenable group, minimal sets.

We obtained the following theorem in this paper, which extends the corresponding result for \mathbb{Z} -actions in [11] and answered a question proposed by E. Glasner and M. Megrelishvili in [5].

Theorem 1.1. *Let G be an amenable group acting on a dendrite X . Suppose K is a minimal set in X . Then (K, G) is equicontinuous, and K is either finite or homeomorphic to the Cantor set.*

Recently, Shi and Ye have shown that every amenable group action on uniquely arcwise connected continua (without the assumption of local connectedness) must have a minimal set consisting of 1 or 2 points (see [17]). We end this section with the following question:

What results holding for group actions on dendrites can be extended to actions on uniquely arcwise connected continua?

In the following, we always assume all the groups appeared in this paper are countable.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Group actions. Let X be a compact metric space and let $\text{Homeo}(X)$ be the homeomorphism group of X . Suppose G is a group. A group homomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(X)$ is called an *action* of G on X ; we use the pair (X, G) to denote the action of G on X . For brevity, we usually use gx or $g(x)$ instead of $\phi(g)(x)$.

The *orbit* of $x \in X$ under the action of G is the set $Gx \equiv \{gx : g \in G\}$. For a subset $A \subseteq X$, set $GA = \bigcup_{x \in A} Gx$; A is said to be *G -invariant*, if $GA = A$; $x \in X$ is called a *fixed point* of G if $Gx = \{x\}$. If A is a G -invariant closed subset of X and the closure $\overline{Gx} = A$ for every $x \in A$, then A is called a *minimal set* of G . When X is a compact metric space, minimal sets always exist by an argument of Zorn's Lemma.

A Borel probability measure μ on X is called *G -invariant* if $\mu(g(A)) = \mu(A)$ for every Borel set A in X and every $g \in G$. The following lemma follows directly from the G -invariance of $\text{supp}(\mu)$.

Lemma 2.1. *If (X, G) is minimal and μ is a G -invariant Borel probability measure on X , then $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let a group G act on a compact metric space X . Suppose K is a minimal set in X and possesses a G -invariant Borel probability measure μ . If U and V are open sets in X such that $g(V \cap K) \subset U \cap K$ for some $g \in G$. Then $K \cap (V \setminus \overline{U}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that there is some $u \in K \cap (V \setminus \overline{U})$. Then there is some open neighborhood W of u with $W \subset V \setminus \overline{U}$. By Lemma 2.1, $\mu(W \cap K) > 0$. Then $\mu(V \cap K) = \mu(g(V \cap K)) \leq \mu(U \cap K) < \mu(V \cap K)$. This is a contradiction. \square

2.2. Amenable group. *Amenability* was first introduced by von Neumann. Recall that a countable group G is *amenable* if there is a sequence of finite sets F_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|gF_i \triangle F_i|}{|F_i|} = 0$ for every $g \in G$, where $|F_i|$ is the number of elements in F_i ; the set F_i is called a *Følner set*. It is well known that solvable groups and finite groups are amenable; any group containing a free noncommutative subgroup is not amenable. One may consult [13] for the proofs of the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *Every subgroup of an amenable group is amenable.*

Lemma 2.4. *A group G is amenable if and only if every action of G on a compact metric space X has a G -invariant Borel probability measure on X .*

2.3. Dendrite. By a *continuum*, we mean a connected compact metric space. A continuum is *nondegenerate* if it is not a single point. An *arc* is a continuum which is homeomorphic to the closed interval $[0, 1]$. A continuum X is *uniquely arcwise connected* if for any two points $x \neq y \in X$ there is a unique arc $[x, y]$ in X , which connects x and y .

A *dendrite* is a locally connected, uniquely arcwise connected continuum. For a dendrite X and a point $c \in X$, if $X \setminus \{c\}$ has exactly 2 components, then c is called a *cut point* of X ; if $X \setminus \{c\}$ has at least 3 components, then c is called a *branch point* of X .

The following lemmas 2.5-2.8 are taken from [10].

Lemma 2.5. *Let X be a dendrite with metric d . Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\text{diam}([x, y]) < \varepsilon$ whenever $d(x, y) < \delta$.*

Lemma 2.6. *Let X be a dendrite. If A_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) is a sequence of mutually disjoint subdendrites of X , then $\text{diam}(A_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.*

Lemma 2.7. *Let X be a dendrite. Then X has at most countably many branch points; if X is nondegenerate, then the cut point set of X is uncountable.*

Lemma 2.8. *Let X be a dendrite and $c \in X$. Then each component U of $X \setminus \{c\}$ is open in X and $\overline{U} = U \cup \{c\}$.*

Now we give a proof of the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *Let X be a dendrite and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a homeomorphism. Suppose o is a fixed point of f . Let c_1, c_2 be cut points of X , which are different from o . Suppose U is a component of $X \setminus \{c_1\}$, which does not contain o ; V is a component of $X \setminus \{c_2\}$, which does not contain o ; $f(c_1) \in V$. Then $f(U) \subset V$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that there is some $u \in U$ with $f(u) \notin V$. Since c_2 is a cut point, $f(c_1) \in V$, $o \notin V$, and $f(o) = o$, we have $c_2 \in [f(o), f(c_1)]$ and $c_2 \in [f(u), f(c_1)]$. This implies $f^{-1}(c_2) \in [o, c_1] \cap [u, c_1] = \{c_1\}$ since $o \notin U$. Thus $f(c_1) = c_2$, which contradicts $f(c_1) \in V$. \square

If $[a, b]$ is an arc in a dendrite X , denote by $[a, b)$, $(a, b]$, and (a, b) the sets $[a, b] \setminus \{b\}$, $[a, b] \setminus \{a\}$, and $[a, b] \setminus \{a, b\}$, respectively.

2.4. Equicontinuity. Let X be a compact metric space with metric d and let G be a group acting on X . Two points $x, y \in X$ are said to be *regionally proximal* if there are sequences $x_i, y_i \in X$ and $g_i \in G$ such that $x_i \rightarrow x$, $y_i \rightarrow y$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, and $\lim g_i x_i = \lim g_i y_i = w$ for some $w \in X$. If x, y are regionally proximal and $x \neq y$, then $\{x, y\}$ are said to be a *nontrivial regionally proximal pair*. The action (X, G) is *equicontinuous* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $d(gx, gy) < \varepsilon$ whenever $d(x, y) < \delta$, for all $g \in G$.

The following lemma can be seen in [1].

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose (X, G) is a group action. Then (X, G) is equicontinuous if and only if it contains no nontrivial regionally proximal pair.*

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section we are going to show our main result. Before doing this we state two simple lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose a group G acts on the closed interval $[0, 1]$. If $K \subset [0, 1]$ is minimal, then K contains at most 2 points.*

Proof. Let $x = \inf K$ and $y = \sup K$. Then G preserves the set $\{x, y\}$. So $K = \{x, y\}$ by the minimality of K . \square

Lemma 3.2 ([16]). *Let G be an amenable group acting on a dendrite X . Then there is a G -invariant set consisting of 1 or 2 points.*

Now we are ready to prove the main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We first show that (K, G) is equicontinuous.

Assume to the contrary that (K, G) is not equicontinuous. Then, from Lemma 2.10, there are $u \neq v \in K$ such that u, v are regionally proximal; that is, there are sequences $u_i, v_i \in X$ and $g_i \in G$ with

$$(3.1) \quad u_i \rightarrow u, v_i \rightarrow v, \lim g_i x_i = \lim g_i y_i = w,$$

for some $w \in K$.

From Lemma 3.2, there are $o_1, o_2 \in X$ such that $\{o_1, o_2\}$ is G -invariant. Then $[o_1, o_2]$ is G -invariant by the uniquely arcwise connectedness of X . From the assumption, K is infinite; so, $K \cap [o_1, o_2] = \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.1. Without loss of generality, we may suppose $o_1 = o_2$, which is denoted by o ; otherwise, we need only collapse $[o_1, o_2]$ to one point. Then o is a G -fixed point.

Case 1. $[u, o] \cap [v, o] = \{o\}$. By Lemma 2.7, we can take cut points $c_1 \in (u, o)$ and $c_2 \in (v, o)$. Let D_u be the component of $X \setminus \{c_1\}$, which contains u ; let D_v be the component of

$X \setminus \{c_2\}$, which contains v . From minimality and Lemma 2.8, there is some $g' \in G$ with $g'w \in D_u$. From (3.1) and Lemma 2.5, when i is large enough, we have

$$(3.2) \quad u_i \in D_u, v_i \in D_v \text{ and } g'g_i[u_i, v_i] \subset D_u.$$

Write $g = g'g_i$. Then $o \in [u_i, v_i]$ and $g(o) \in D_u$. This is a contradiction, since o is fixed by G .

Case 2. $[u, o] \cap [v, o] = [z, o]$ for some $z \neq o$.

Subcase 2.1. $z = v$. Then $u \neq z$ and $z \in K$. Take a cut point $c_1 \in (u, z)$. Let D_u be the component of $X \setminus \{c_1\}$, which contains u . Then $v \notin D_u$, and there is some $g \in G$ with $gz \in D_u$ by the minimality of K . Take a cut point $c_2 \in (z, o)$ which is sufficiently close to z such that $g(c_2) \in D_u$. Let D_z be the component of $X \setminus \{c_2\}$ which contains z . By Lemma 2.4, there is a G -invariant Borel probability measure on K . Applying Lemma 2.9, we get $g(D_z) \subset D_u$; this contradicts Lemma 2.2, since $z \in D_z \setminus \overline{D_u}$.

Subcase 2.2. $z = u$. Similar to the argument in Subcase 2.1, we can get a contradiction.

Subcase 2.3. $z \neq u$ and $z \neq v$. Take a cut point $c_1 \in (u, z)$. Let D_u be the component of $X \setminus \{c_1\}$, which contains u . Similar to the argument in Case 1, there is some $g \in G$ with $g(z) \in D_u$. Take a cut point $c_2 \in (z, o)$ which is sufficiently close to z such that $g(c_2) \in D_u$. Let D_z be the component of $X \setminus \{c_2\}$, which contains z . Then $g(D_z) \subset D_u$ by Lemma 2.9. This contradicts Lemma 2.2 since $v \in D_z \setminus \overline{D_u}$.

Now we prove that if K is not finite, then K is homeomorphic to the Cantor set. Otherwise, there is some nondegenerate connected component Y of K . Clearly, for any $g, g' \in G$, either $g(Y) = g'(Y)$ or $g(Y) \cap g'(Y) = \emptyset$. This together with Lemma 2.6 and the equicontinuity of (K, G) implies that the subgroup $H = \{g \in G : g(Y) = Y\}$ has finite index in G . So, (Y, H) is minimal. This contradicts Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 2.3, since Y is a nondegenerate dendrite. □

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Eli Glasner for sending us the early version of his work with Megrelishvili. The work is supported by NSFC (No. 11771318, 11790274, 11431012).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Auslander, Minimal flows and their extensions. North-Holl. Math. Stud. 153, North-Holland, 1988.
- [2] B.H. Bowditch, Hausdorff dimension and dendritic limit sets. Math. Ann. 332 (2005), 667-676.
- [3] B. Duchesne and N. Monod, Group actions on dendrites and curves, arXiv:1609.00303v3, 2016.

- [4] É. Ghys, Groups acting on the circle. *L'Enseign. Math.* 47 (2001), 329-407.
- [5] E. Glasner and M. Megrelishvili, Group actions on treelike compact spaces, [arXiv:1806.09876](#).
- [6] A.V. Malyutin, On groups acting on dendrites, (Russian) *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* 415 (2013), *Geometriya i Topologiya*. 12, 62-74; translation in *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)* 212 (2016), 558-565.
- [7] G. Margulis, Free subgroup of the homeomorphism group of the circle. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 331 (2000), 669-674.
- [8] H. Marzougui and I. Naghmouchi, Minimal sets for group actions on dendrites. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 144 (2016), 4413-4425.
- [9] Y.N. Minsky, On rigidity, limit sets, and ends of hyperbolic 3-manifolds. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 7 (1994) 539-588.
- [10] S.B. Nadler Jr., *Continuum Theory*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1992.
- [11] I. Naghmouchi, Dynamical properties of monotone dendrite maps, *Topology Appl.* 159 (2012), 144-149.
- [12] A. Navas, Grupos de difeomorfismos del círculo. (Spanish) [Groups of diffeomorphisms of the circle] *Ensaios Matemáticos [Mathematical Surveys]*, 13. Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática, Rio de Janeiro, 2007.
- [13] A.L.T. Paterson, *Amenability*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988.
- [14] E.H. Shi, Free subgroups of dendrite homeomorphism group. *Topology Appl.* 159 (2012), no. 10-11, 2662-2668.
- [15] E.H. Shi, S.H. Wang, and L.Z. Zhou, Minimal group actions on dendrites. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 138 (2010), no. 1, 217-223.
- [16] E.H. Shi and X. Ye, Periodic points for amenable group actions on dendrites. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 145 (2017), 177-184.
- [17] E.H. Shi and X. Ye, Periodic points for amenable group actions on uniquely arcwise connected continua. [arXiv:1710.03411](#).

(E.H. Shi) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SOOCHOW UNIVERSITY, SUZHOU 215006, P. R. CHINA

E-mail address: ehshi@suda.edu.cn

(X. Ye) WU WEN-TSUN KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS, USTC, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF CHINA, HEFEI, ANHUI 230026, CHINA

E-mail address: yexd@ustc.edu.cn