

# Selection from Hierarchical Data with Conformal e-values

Yonghoon Lee and Zhimei Ren

Department of Statistics and Data Science, the Wharton School,  
University of Pennsylvania

January 7, 2025

## Abstract

Distribution-free predictive inference beyond the construction of prediction sets has gained a lot of interest in recent applications. One such application is the selection task, where the objective is to design a reliable selection rule to pick out individuals with desired unobserved outcomes while controlling the error rate. In this work, we address the selection problem in the context of hierarchical data, where groups of observations may exhibit distinct within-group distributions. This generalizes existing techniques beyond the standard i.i.d./exchangeable data settings. For hierarchical data, we introduce methods to construct valid conformal e-values, enabling control of the false discovery rate (FDR) through the e-BH procedure. In particular, we introduce and compare two approaches—*subsampling conformal e-values* and *hierarchical conformal e-values*. Empirical results demonstrate that both approaches achieve valid FDR control while highlighting a tradeoff between stability and power. The subsampling-based method, though random, typically offers higher power, whereas the hierarchical approach, being deterministic, tends to be slightly less powerful. The effectiveness of the proposed methods is illustrated in two real-world applications.

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, artificial intelligence has demonstrated remarkable predictive power across a wide range of fields, showing great promise in assisting humans with decision-making. Consider the task of selecting units from a large pool of candidates whose unobserved outcomes meet specific desirable criteria. Leveraging machine-predicted outcomes to identify and shortlist a subset of promising candidates can significantly streamline the decision-making process, reducing the need for extensive experiments or investigations. Indeed, machine learning algorithms have been used to find protein structures with desired functions [Watson et al., 2023], to identify promising drug candidates [Dara et al., 2022], or to select a cohort of patients for clinical trials [Lehman et al., 2012, Xiong et al., 2019].

In many of these applications, making a wrong selection can be costly—whether in terms of time, money, or even human welfare. When relying on machine learning algorithms to make predictions, it is crucial to have a reliable method for assessing the uncertainty of the predictions and for controlling the error rate of the selection procedure. To this end, Jin and Candès [2023b] proposed *Conformal Selection*, a prediction-assisted selection framework that controls the false discovery rate (FDR) of the selected set. Formally, suppose we have training data  $(X_i, Y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ , and then given multiple new inputs  $X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m}$  (the candidate pool), we aim to select a subset of them whose unobserved outcomes  $Y_{n+1}, \dots, Y_{n+m}$  meet a certain condition, e.g.,  $Y_{n+j}$  that exceeds some threshold  $c$ . The FDR of a selected set is defined as

$$\text{FDR} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1} \{Y_{n+j} \text{ does not satisfy the condition but unit } n+j \text{ selected}\}}{\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1} \{\text{unit } n+j \text{ selected}\}} \right] \leq \alpha,$$

where we follow the convention that  $0/0 = 0$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is a pre-defined level. At a high level, conformal selection formulates the selection task as a multiple hypotheses testing problem, where each unit in the test set is associated with a hypothesis and rejecting a null hypothesis means selecting the corresponding unit. It then constructs a p-value for each hypothesis, and obtain the selection set by applying the Benjamini Hochberg [Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995] (BH) procedure to the p-values. It is proved in Jin and Candès [2023b] that conformal selection achieves FDR control as long as the training and the test data are *jointly exchangeable*.

## 1.1 Selection with hierarchical data

In reality, data often exhibits more complex structures, requiring procedures that function under weaker assumptions. In this work, we examine a setting where the data has a hierarchical structure, meaning that the data points are organized into groups. Below, we discuss several examples of hierarchical data-generating processes.

**Multi-environment data.** In many modern applications, data are collected from multiple environments, where the data-generating distributions vary across environments [Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2015, Rothenhäusler et al., 2021, Guo, 2024]. For example, researchers may collect data from multiple sites to test a scientific hypothesis [Higgins et al., 2009]; electronic health record data often aggregate data from various hospitals [Singh et al., 2022]; many genetic studies include cohorts representing diverse populations [Keys et al., 2020]. The data-generating process of such multi-environment data is often modeled hierarchically: each environment’s distribution is considered a random draw from a prior distribution, while the data points within the environment are sampled from that environment-specific distribution [Duchi et al., 2024, Jeong and Rothenhäusler, 2022, 2024].

**Cluster-randomized trials.** Cluster randomized trials (CRTs) are a class of experimental methods widely used in empirical studies. In CRTs, treatments are randomly assigned at the cluster level, where clusters can represent villages, cities, schools, or similar groups [Murray, 1998, Donner et al., 2000, Ramdas et al., 2019, Su and Ding, 2021, Jin and Ba, 2023]. In these applications, the data-generating process often follows a hierarchical structure, where the clusters are drawn from a (prior) distribution and the units in each class from a cluster-specific distribution [Wang et al., 2024b,a].

**Repeated observations.** When the units in a study have multiple independent observations, a natural hierarchical structure emerges: the units can be treated as clusters, with the repeated observations acting as elements within those clusters. Such a setting arises when, for example, a medical sample has multiple doctor ratings [Liu et al., 2020], or when a data point receives multiple annotations [Stutz et al., 2023].

In the context of hierarchical data, our work considers a decision-making task—given multiple new clusters of test points, the goal is to select test units/clusters whose unobserved outcomes meet a certain condition with guarantees on the *selected* units/clusters. For example, in job hiring, the candidates may be coming from different regions with different distributions of skills: how can we select candidates whose (yet-to-be-observed) work performance exceeds a certain threshold, while controlling the error rate of the selection process? In cluster randomized trials, how to select the individuals with large individual treatment effects with a controlled error rate. We offer a solution to these questions building on conformal inference [Vovk et al., 2005].

Throughout this work, the data is assumed to satisfy *hierarchical exchangeability*—formally defined later—that essentially means that the groups of observations are exchangeable, and the observations within each group are exchangeable as well. Note that the exchangeability of the entire dataset can be considered a special case within this framework. In the context of such hierarchical data, we study the selection task given new groups of feature inputs. In what follows, we shall first discuss the selection of individual test points, and then extend the procedure to the selection of both groups and individuals.

## 1.2 Our contributions

This work presents a general recipe for model-free selection with hierarchical data. The recipe allows practitioners to leverage the power of complex machine learning algorithms for selection while enjoying rigorous error control guarantees on the selected units. We highlight our main contributions below.

- *Model-free selection for hierarchical data.* We consider a suite of selection tasks under a hierarchical data-generating process—selecting individuals, selecting groups, and selecting a combination of both. For each task, we formulate the selection problem as a (structured) multiple hypothesis testing problem, and provide a testing procedure with provable FDR control. The key idea is to construct an *e-value*—to be introduced shortly—for each hypothesis, and apply e-value-based multiple testing procedures to control the FDR.
- *Extension of e-value-based multiple testing.* Our work extends the e-value-based multiple testing framework to a setting where the number of hypotheses is random and the data has a hierarchical

structure, under which we characterize sufficient conditions for FDR control. To show that the e-values satisfy the properties required for FDR control, we adopt a careful treatment to address the challenge brought by the hierarchical structure, which can be of independent interest.

- *Empirical evaluation.* We evaluate the validity and power of the proposed methods through extensive simulations and real data analysis. The results show that the proposed methods achieve the desired FDR control while maintaining competitive power.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the problem setup and lay out the relevant background. Section 3 presents our main results, including the construction of e-values for hierarchical data and the FDR control procedure. In Section 4, we discuss extensions to other selection tasks and settings. In Section 5 and 6, we present empirical results, and we conclude in Section 7.

### 1.3 Notations

We write  $\mathbb{R}$  to denote the real space,  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to denote the  $d$ -dimensional real space, and  $\mathbb{N}$  to denote the set of positive integers. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $[n]$  denotes the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and  $v_{1:n}$  denotes the vector  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)^\top$ .  $\mathcal{S}_n = \{\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n], \sigma \text{ is a bijection}\}$  denotes the set of all permutations of  $[n]$ . For any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$  and  $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$ . For a set  $A$ ,  $|A|$  refers to its cardinality.

## 2 Problem setup

Suppose we have training samples from  $K \geq 1$  groups, with  $N_k$  samples in group  $k \in [K]$ :  $Z_{k,1}, \dots, Z_{k,N_k}$ . Each  $Z_{k,i}$  denotes the tuple  $(X_{k,i}, Y_{k,i})$ , where  $X_{k,i} \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is the feature vector and  $Y_{k,i} \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is the outcome. Denote by  $G_1, \dots, G_K \in \mathcal{G}$  the group-specific features and  $\tilde{Z}_k = (Z_{k,1}, \dots, Z_{k,N_k})$  for  $k \in [K]$ . Suppose we are given new inputs  $(G_k, X_{k,i})_{K+1 \leq k \leq K+M, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$  without their corresponding outcomes  $(Y_{k,i})_{K+1 \leq k \leq K+M, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$ . We impose the following assumptions on the data-generating process.

**Assumption 1** (Hierarchical exchangeability). *The dataset  $(G_k, \tilde{Z}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq K+M}$  satisfies the following:*

1. *The sequence of random vectors  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_K, \tilde{Z}_{K+1}, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{K+M}$  satisfies hierarchical exchangeability, i.e., for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{K+M}$ ,*

$$(\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{K+M}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\tilde{Z}_{\sigma(1)}, \tilde{Z}_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{\sigma(K+M)}),$$

*and furthermore, for any  $m \geq 1$ ,  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_m$  and  $k \in [K+M]$ ,*

$$(\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{K+M}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{k-1}, (Z_{k,\sigma(1)}, Z_{k,\sigma(2)}, \dots, Z_{k,\sigma(m)}), \tilde{Z}_{k+1}, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{K+M}) \mid N_k = m.$$

2. *The group size  $N_k$  is independent of the individual observations in the  $k$ -th group, as well as the observations in other groups, i.e., for any  $k \in [K+M]$  and  $m \geq 1$ ,*

$$(Z_{k,1}, \dots, Z_{k,m}), (G_l, N_l, \tilde{Z}_l)_{l \neq k} \mid N_k = m \stackrel{d}{=} (Z_{k,1}, \dots, Z_{k,m}), (G_l, N_l, \tilde{Z}_l)_{l \neq k}.$$

The first condition states that the dataset has between-group exchangeability in the sense that the groups of observations  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{K+M}$  are exchangeable, as well as the within-group exchangeability, that is, for each  $k$ ,  $\tilde{Z}_k = (Z_{k,1}, \dots, Z_{k,N_k})$  is a vector of exchangeable variables given the other groups. A special case satisfying Assumption 1 is the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} G_1, G_2, \dots, G_K &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_G, \\ N_1, N_2, \dots, N_K &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_N, \\ Z_{k,1}, Z_{k,2}, \dots, Z_{k,N_k} &\mid G_k, N_k \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{Z|G}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $P_G$  is some distribution over the distributions on  $(X, Y)$ ,  $P_N$  is the distribution on  $\mathbb{N}$  of the group sizes, and  $P_{Z|G}$  is the distribution of the observations within each group.

Under this setting, we consider the task of selecting test points whose outcomes meet some desired property. Without loss of generality, we focus on the selection of individuals with large outcomes; however, methods discussed in this paper can be generalized to accommodate other types of selection

criteria. Given the test samples, the task of selecting individuals with large outcomes can be equivalently formulated as testing the following set of random hypotheses:

$$H_{j,i} : Y_{K+j,i} \leq c(X_{K+j,i}), \quad j = 1, \dots, M, i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{K+j}, \quad (2)$$

where  $c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a predefined threshold function. For notational simplicity, we write  $C_{j,i} = c(X_{j,i})$  for each  $(j, i)$  pair. Here, rejecting  $H_{j,i}$  demonstrates evidence that the  $(K + j, i)$ -th individual has an outcome exceeding the threshold  $C_{j,i}$ , so we select the individuals whose corresponding null hypotheses are rejected.

Our goal now is to develop a multiple testing procedure for  $\{H_{j,i} : j \in [M], i \in [N_{K+j}]\}$  that controls the false discovery rate (FDR). With the above notation, the FDR is defined as the expectation of false discovery (selection) proportion (FDP), given by

$$\text{FDP} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{(j, i) \in \mathcal{R}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\}}{|\mathcal{R}| \vee 1},$$

where  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \{(j, i) : j \in [M], i \in [N_{K+j}]\}$  denotes the set of indices whose corresponding null hypothesis is rejected. Throughout the paper, we consider a slightly stronger notion of FDR, which conditions on the group sizes:

$$\text{cFDR} = \mathbb{E}[\text{FDP} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}]. \quad (3)$$

By the law of total expectation, controlling the above conditional FDR implies the control of the marginal FDR, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[\text{FDP}]$ .

Beyond the individual selection task formulated above, we will discuss extensions to hierarchical selection tasks (group nulls, hybrid nulls), counterfactual selection, and the setting with distribution shift in Section 4.

## 2.1 Multiple testing with e-values

The main statistical tool we use for testing the hypotheses in (2) is the e-value [Grünwald et al., 2024, Shafer, 2021, Vovk and Wang, 2021, Ramdas and Wang, 2024]. Similar to a p-value, an e-value is a measure of the strength of evidence against the null hypothesis. Formally, given a null hypothesis  $H_0$ , the e-value  $e$  is defined as the realization of an e-variable  $E$  s.t.  $E \geq 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{H_0}[E] \leq 1$ . Following the convention in the literature, we do not distinguish between the e-variable and its realization, using  $e$  to denote both.

Suppose there are  $m$  hypotheses  $H_1, \dots, H_m$ , and each hypothesis  $H_j$  is associated with an e-value  $e_j, \forall j \in [m]$ . Wang and Ramdas [2022] proposed the e-BH procedure, which takes the e-values as input, ranks them in a descending order  $e_{(1)} \geq \dots \geq e_{(m)}$ , and rejects the hypotheses with their corresponding e-values exceeding  $m/(\alpha k^*)$ . Here,  $k^* = \max\{k \in [m] : e_{(k)} \geq m/(\alpha k)\}$ , with the convention that  $\max\{\emptyset\} = 0$ . The e-BH procedure provably controls the FDR at level  $\alpha$  as long as the e-values are valid. In fact, as pointed out by Wang and Ramdas [2022], it suffices to impose the following conditions on the e-values to ensure FDR control:

$$e_j \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{j \in [m]} \mathbb{E}[e_j \mathbb{1}\{H_j \text{ true}\}] \leq m. \quad (4)$$

It can be easily seen that (4) is a relaxation of the ‘‘bona fide’’ e-values, which requires  $\mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq 1$  for all  $j \in [m]$ . The (set of) e-values defined by (4) are termed as the *compound e-values* in Ignatiadis et al. [2024a].

Our work builds upon the e-BH procedure, extending it to the hierarchical data setting, where the number of hypotheses is random and the data has a hierarchical structure. En route, we construct e-values for the hypotheses in (2), which are themselves new examples of compound e-values.

## 2.2 Related works

Conformal prediction and distribution-free inference have gained significant attention in recent literature. An overview of this area is provided in Vovk et al. [2005], Shafer and Vovk [2008], Angelopoulos and Bates [2021], and Angelopoulos et al. [2024]. Conformal prediction and split conformal prediction—general frameworks for distribution-free predictive inference—are introduced in Vovk et al. [2005] and Papadopoulos [2008]. Additionally, Barber et al. [2021] propose Jackknife+, a computationally feasible method for constructing distribution-free prediction sets without data splitting.

Several recent works have sought to extend the conformal prediction framework to structured or asymmetric data, where the i.i.d. or exchangeability assumptions may not be reasonable. [Dunn et al. \[2022\]](#) and [Lee et al. \[2023\]](#) consider the hierarchical setting, providing methodologies that construct distribution-free prediction sets for a test input in a new cluster; [Liu et al. \[2024\]](#) and [Duchi et al. \[2024\]](#) consider the same setting, but focus on cluster-level outcomes. [Dobriban and Yu \[2023\]](#) address the case of data with group symmetries. Other lines of work explore inference under distribution shift. [Tibshirani et al. \[2019\]](#) introduce *weighted conformal prediction*, which provides a distribution-free prediction set given knowledge of the likelihood ratio of feature distributions. Their method has been further developed in several subsequent works, such as [Lei and Candès \[2021\]](#) and [Candès et al. \[2023\]](#). In another line of work, [Barber et al. \[2023\]](#), [Cauchois et al. \[2024\]](#), [Ai and Ren \[2024\]](#), [Gui et al. \[2024a\]](#) consider prediction interval construction accounting for the worst-case distributional shifts within a class of distributions.

Predictive inference on multiple test points has also been a focus in a number of recent studies. For example, [Vovk \[2013\]](#) discuss constructing a prediction region for the vector of multiple test outcomes, [Lee et al. \[2024a\]](#) study the construction of simultaneous prediction sets for multiple outcomes under covariate shift, and [Lee et al. \[2024b\]](#) propose a method for inference on a function of test points. Our work is closely related to [Jin and Candès \[2023b,a\]](#), which introduce a methodology for selecting test points under the i.i.d. assumption or distribution shift. These works extend the results of [Bates et al. \[2023\]](#), which study the outlier detection problem; see also [Marandon et al. \[2024\]](#), [Bashari et al. \[2024\]](#), [Liang et al. \[2024\]](#), [Gui et al. \[2024b\]](#).

Our work is also closely related to multiple hypothesis testing. Specifically, the control of the false discovery rate employs the e-BH procedure from [Wang and Ramdas \[2022\]](#), which extends the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure [[Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995](#)] to work with e-values instead of p-values. E-values have attracted considerable attention in recent literature of multiple testing, with methods such as e-filter [[Gablenz and Sabatti, 2024](#)] (which extends the p-filter [[Ramdas et al., 2019](#)]) addressing multiple testing with a group structure. Further recent advancements in e-value-based multiple testing include works by [Ignatiadis et al. \[2024b\]](#), [Ren and Barber \[2024\]](#), [Lee and Ren \[2024\]](#), [Fischer and Ramdas \[2024\]](#), [Ignatiadis et al. \[2024a\]](#), among others.

### 3 Main results

Recall that our primary goal is to simultaneously test the null hypotheses in (2) while controlling the cFDR defined in (3). The main strategy in this work is to construct a ‘conditional’ e-value  $e_{j,i}$  for each  $H_{j,i}$ , which satisfies

$$e_{j,i} \geq 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \leq 1. \quad (5)$$

Modifying the proof of [Wang and Ramdas \[2022\]](#), we can show that applying the e-BH procedure to the above notion of e-values at level  $\alpha$  controls the cFDR (3) at level  $\alpha$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose that random variables  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  satisfy the condition in (5), for any  $j \in [M]$ ,  $i \in [N_{K+j}]$ . Then the e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  at level  $\alpha$  guarantees  $\text{cFDR} \leq \alpha$ , where cFDR denotes the conditional false discovery rate (3).*

The complete proof of Lemma 1 is deferred to Appendix A.1. We note that even if our goal is solely to control the marginal FDR, the condition in (5) on the group size-conditional expectation is still necessary to achieve the guarantee through the e-BH procedure, as the number of hypotheses is random.

The remaining task is to construct the e-values  $e_{j,i}$  satisfying (5). In the following, we present two methods for constructing such e-values, the subsampling conformal e-values and the hierarchical conformal e-values. The two approaches present an interesting tradeoff between stability and statistical power, with the former being random but empirically more powerful while the latter stable yet less powerful. We leave the choice between these two approaches to the users depending on their practical desiderata.

#### 3.1 Selection with subsampling conformal e-values

We first split the labeled dataset into a training set and a calibration set. On the training set, we construct a score function  $s : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , such that a smaller value of  $s(X, c)$  serves as stronger evidence of rejecting  $Y \leq c$ . A simple example is  $s(x, y) = y - \hat{\mu}(x)$ , where  $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$  is an estimator of the mean function  $\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid X = x]$ . Throughout the paper, we will regard the score function as given and fixed—i.e.,

we are essentially conditioning everything on the training data and letting  $\{Z_{k,i}\}_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$  denote the calibration set.

Next, we define  $\widehat{V}_{k,i} = s(X_{k,i}, C_{k,i})$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K + M$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N_k$ . By construction,  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}$  can be viewed as a test statistic for  $H_{j,i}$ , where a smaller  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}$  represents stronger evidence against the null. To construct the e-value, we sub-sample one unit from each group uniformly at random in the calibration set:

$$i_k^* \mid N_k \sim \text{Unif}(\{1, 2, \dots, N_k\}), \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (6)$$

The idea is that the subsamples and the test data  $Z_{K+j,i}$  are jointly exchangeable, and we shall leverage this exchangeability to construct the e-values satisfying (5). The scheme is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: A schematic illustration of the construction of subsampling conformal e-values. The subsampling procedure selects one unit from each group uniformly at random in the calibration data. The e-value  $e_{j,i}$  is constructed based on the subsampled units and the test data.

Specifically, for any  $j \in [M]$  and  $i \in [N_{K+j}]$ , we construct a statistic  $e_{j,i}$  for  $H_{j,i}$  as follows.

$$e_{j,i} = \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < T_j, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + 1} \cdot (K + 1), \quad (7)$$

where  $T_j$  is a stopping-time-type threshold, defined as

$$T_j = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < t, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + 1}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l=1}^M N_{K+l}}{K + 1}. \quad (8)$$

Here,  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is a predefined threshold, not necessarily equal to the target level  $\alpha$ . A recommended choice for  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is a value slightly smaller than  $\alpha$ , e.g.,  $\tilde{\alpha} = 0.9\alpha$ , for better statistical power [Ren and Barber, 2024]. Intuitively, the non-null scores tend to be small, so the numerator of (7) tends to be positive when  $H_{j,i}$  is not true; the null scores, on the other hand, tend to be large, leading to a relatively small denominator. The resulting e-value is therefore expected to be large for non-nulls. We summarize the complete procedure in Algorithm 1 and prove the following.

**Theorem 1.** *Under Assumption 1, for any choice of  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ , the statistic  $e_{j,i}$  defined by (7) is an e-value for  $H_{j,i}$  conditional on  $N_{K+1:K+M}$  (i.e.,  $e_{j,i}$  satisfies (5)). Consequently, the e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  at level  $\alpha$  guarantees  $\text{cFDR} \leq \alpha$ .*

The proof of Theorem 1 is deferred to Appendix A.2. We have so far established that the statistic  $e_{j,i}$  from (7) is a valid conditional e-value and applying the e-BH procedure to the  $e_{j,i}$ s results in valid cFDR control. Throughout the paper, we refer to  $e_{j,i}$  defined in (7) as the *subsampling conformal e-value*. Two remarks are in order.

**Remark 1** (Relation to selection with conformal p-values). *Applying the idea of Jin and Ren [2024], we can construct the ‘subsampling conformal p-value’ for  $H_{j,i}$  as*

$$p_{j,i} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} \leq \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + 1}{K + 1}, \quad (9)$$

which satisfies the condition  $\mathbb{P} \{ p_{j,i} \leq \alpha \text{ and } H_{j,i} \text{ holds} \} \leq \alpha$  for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

However, applying the BH procedure (we shall refer to it as the p-BH procedure to distinguish it from e-BH) to  $(p_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$  does not guarantee control of the FDR at the desired level due to the complex

---

**Algorithm 1:** Selection of hierarchical data with subsampling conformal e-values
 

---

**Input:** Calibration data  $(X_{k,i}, Y_{k,i})_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$ , Score function  $s : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , Test inputs  $(X_{k,i})_{K+1 \leq k \leq K+M, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$ , Cutoff function  $c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , Target level  $\alpha$ , Parameter for threshold  $\tilde{\alpha}$ .

**Step 1:** Draw  $i_k^* \mid N_k \sim \text{Unif}(\{1, 2, \dots, N_k\})$  for  $k \in [K]$ .

**Step 2:** Compute  $C_{k,i_k^*} = c(X_{k,i_k^*})$  and  $\widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} = s(X_{k,i_k^*}, C_{k,i_k^*})$  for  $k \in [K]$ , and  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} = s(X_{K+j,i}, c(X_{K+j,i}))$  for  $j \in [M]$ ,  $i \in [N_k]$ .

**Step 3:** Compute the threshold  $T_j$  according to (8).

**Step 4:** Compute the e-value  $e_{j,i}$  according to (7) for  $j \in [M]$  and  $i \in [N_{K+j}]$ .

**Step 5:** Sort the e-values:  $e_{(1)} \geq e_{(2)} \geq \dots \geq e_{(n_{\text{test}})}$ , where  $n_{\text{test}} = \sum_{k=1}^M N_{K+k}$ .

**Step 6:** (e-BH procedure): Compute  $l^* = \max \left\{ l \in [n_{\text{test}}] : \frac{le_{(l)}}{n_{\text{test}}} \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \right\}$ .

**Output:** Selection set  $\mathcal{R} = \{(j, i) : e_{j,i} \geq e_{(l^*)}\}$ .

---

dependence structure among the  $p_{j,i}$ 's, as well as the randomness in the overall number of hypotheses being tested. Nonetheless, we will demonstrate that it still performs well empirically.

In fact, it turns out that the procedure using  $p$ -values exhibits a rejection rule similar to the  $e$ -value based procedure described in Algorithm 1. Specifically, the rejection rule of the  $p$ -BH procedure applied with  $p_{j,i}$ 's is equivalent to:

$$\text{reject } H_{j,i} \text{ if } \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T^{\text{p-BH}}, \text{ where } T^{\text{p-BH}} = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}^{\text{p-BH}}(t) \leq \alpha \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\widehat{\text{FDP}}^{\text{p-BH}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < t, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + 1}{1 \vee \sum_{l=1}^M \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l=1}^M N_{K+l}}{K+1}.$$

Note that  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_j$  differs from  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}^{\text{p-BH}}$  only in that the summation in the denominator excludes the  $j$ -th test group. Thus, the threshold  $T_j$  in the construction of the  $e$ -value can also be viewed as a ‘correction’ of  $T^{\text{p-BH}}$  that enables valid FDR control.

**Remark 2** (Selection based on both individual and group features). *The selection procedure in Algorithm 1 ensures valid FDR control but does not utilize all the information provided by the training/calibration data, in the sense that the group-feature observations  $(G_k)_{1 \leq k \leq K+M}$  are not used in the inference. However, in settings where the group features are considered more than just side information, one might desire to construct a test statistic that depends on both the group and individual features.*

In fact, the same procedure can be applied to a score that depends on both individual and group feature observations. Specifically, suppose we construct a score function  $s : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and then define  $\widehat{V}_{k,i} = s(G_k, X_{k,i}, C_{k,i})$ , constructing  $e_{j,i}$ 's according to (6) and (7). Under the additional assumption of the exchangeability of  $G_k$ 's, the same argument used in the proof of Theorem 1 shows that these  $e_{j,i}$ 's are valid  $e$ -values as in (5). Consequently, we can control the FDR by applying the  $e$ -BH procedure with such group feature-dependent test statistics.

**Merging e-values** The subsampling conformal  $e$ -value-based selection procedure offers valid FDR control but relies on a random subset of the calibration data and involves external randomness (recall that it uses  $K$  randomly drawn observations according to step 6 in Algorithm 1).

In settings where we have a small number of groups with large group sizes, the procedure does not efficiently utilize the information in the calibration data. Although this does not significantly affect the validity or power of inference (since all observations in the training split can still be used for training), one might consider drawing multiple samples and merging the resulting  $e$ -values for more stable results.

Specifically, one option is to use the following derandomized  $e$ -values. For each  $j \in [M]$  and  $i \in N_{K+j}$ ,

$$e_{j,i}^{\text{derandomized}} = \frac{1}{N_1 N_2 \dots N_K} \sum_{(i_1^*, \dots, i_K^*) \in [N_1] \times \dots \times [N_K]} \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j^* \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < T_j^*, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + 1} \cdot (K+1), \quad (11)$$



where for each  $(i_1^*, \dots, i_K^*)$ ,  $T_j^*$  denotes the corresponding cutoff  $T_j$ , defined according to (8). It directly follows from the linearity of expectation and the argument in the proof of Theorem 1 that the e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i}^{\text{derandomized}})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  also controls the FDR.

Alternatively, in settings where the number of groups or the group sizes is large, direct computation of the derandomized e-value becomes difficult. In such cases, we can instead consider the average of e-values from multiple samples. Suppose we repeat drawing  $(i_1^*, \dots, i_K^*)$  based on (6),  $r$  times. Let us denote the  $l$ -th sample as  $(i_1^l, \dots, i_K^l)$ , and then we consider for each  $j \in [K]$  and  $i \in [N_{K+j}]$  the following statistic:

$$e_{j,i}^{\text{average}} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{l=1}^r \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j^l \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^l} < T_j^l, Y_{k,i_k^l} \leq C_{k,i_k^l} \right\} + 1} \cdot (K+1), \quad (12)$$

where  $T_j^l$  is defined as (8) with  $(i_1^*, \dots, i_K^*) = (i_1^l, \dots, i_K^l)$ . Once more, it directly follows from Theorem 1 that applying the BH procedure to  $(e_{j,i}^{\text{average}})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  also yields a valid FDR control.

However, it turns out that merging e-values with different stopping time thresholds, as described above, often leads to a significant loss of power empirically. For an intuitive explanation, recall that each e-value from different samples is either zero or a constant. This means the procedure strictly sacrifices power for signals deemed ‘ambiguous’. However, this ‘ambiguity’ depends on the specific subsampled calibration set. During the combining steps, potentially many signals with corresponding e-values that include multiple zeroes—due to the strict sacrificing strategy—tend to have small average e-values, leading to an overall loss of power.

In Section 3.2, we introduce an alternative, non-randomized method that combines information from multiple observations and achieves reasonable power. Further discussions and comparisons will also be provided.

**Improving power with U-eBH procedure** Observe that in Algorithm 1, the hypotheses for the  $(K+j)$ -th group share the same threshold  $T_j$ . Thus, the role of the e-BH procedure within each group is essentially to make a binary choice—either to reject the hypotheses whose corresponding scores  $\widehat{V}_{j,i}$  are below the threshold or to reject none. If the nonzero e-values have a small value, then the latter is more likely to be chosen, leading to a loss of power. To make the former more likely to happen, one can apply the U-eBH procedure [Xu and Ramdas, 2023], which boosts the e-values with a uniform random variable. Specifically, let  $U \sim \text{Unif}([0, 1])$  be an independent uniform random variable, and then define

$$e_{j,i}^U = e_{j,i}/U, \forall j \in [M], i \in [N_{K+j}], \quad (13)$$

where  $e_{j,i}$  follows the definition (7). Then the following holds.

**Corollary 1** (Theorem 4, Xu and Ramdas [2023]). *The e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i}^U)_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  at level  $\alpha$  guarantees  $\text{FDR} \leq \alpha$ .*

Two remarks are in order.

**Remark 3.** *One might be concerned that the boosting step is introducing external randomness to the procedure, which increases the variability of the output, and can potentially be used for “randomness hacking”, i.e., the user keeps generating random numbers until the desired outcome is achieved. As a remedy discussed in Xu and Ramdas [2023], one can use the internal randomness to obtain such a random variable. For example, we can reserve the first group in the calibration set to construct a (super-)uniform random variable by permutation.*

**Remark 4.** *Note that the boosting step (13) does not change the rejection threshold  $T_j$ , i.e., the hypothesis  $H_{j,i}$  whose corresponding score  $\widehat{V}_{j,i}$  is larger than  $T_j$  is still never rejected regardless of the value of  $U$ . Thus, in our setting, the boosting step does not significantly modify the selection rule—it merely reweighs the binary decision.*

### 3.2 Selection with hierarchical conformal e-values

The procedure with the e-values (7) leads to valid inference, and demonstrates good power, as we will illustrate through simulations. However, since it requires a subsampling step in which a sample is drawn from each group (and the rest are discarded), this may lead to unstable results when the group number



is small. Specifically, although the average of the false discovery proportion (FDP) and the empirical power—i.e., the FDR and power—are both satisfactory across multiple trials, the FDP and empirical power in individual trials can be highly variable depending on the subsampled calibration set. One strategy to address this is to merge the e-values as described in 3.1. However, it turns out that merging e-values with different thresholds/stopping times often results in a significant loss of power.

Alternatively, one can consider directly constructing a test statistic that utilizes all observations in the calibration set, yielding a non-randomized procedure with a unified threshold. The intuition behind this approach is that: instead of randomly drawing a data point from each group, we ‘aggregate’ the data points within a group by weighting each data point inversely proportional to its group size—such that the ‘aggregated unit’ is still comparable to the test unit, roughly speaking. We then construct an e-value by contrasting the aggregated calibration units with the test unit, and show its validity using the within- and across-group exchangeability. Figure 2 is a pictorial demonstration of this scheme.




Figure 2: An illustration of the hierarchical conformal e-value. For group  $k \in [K]$ , the data points are combined with a weight  $1/N_k$ . The hierarchical conformal e-value is constructed by contrasting the test unit with the aggregated calibration units.

Before introducing the exact construction of such e-values, we first examine the following *hierarchical conformal p-value* to provide intuition:

$$p_{j,i} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ V_{k,i'} \leq \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} \right\} + 1}{K+1}, \quad \forall j \in [M], i \in [N_{K+j}]. \quad (14)$$

This construction of the hierarchical conformal ap-value is motivated by the hierarchical conformal prediction methodology introduced by Lee et al. [2023]. With the additional assumption of score monotonicity, it can be shown that the above  $p_{j,i}$  is indeed a valid p-value. We formally state this result in the proposition below and delegate its proof to Appendix A.3.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose that the hierarchical data  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_K, \tilde{Z}_{K+1}, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{K+M}$  satisfies Assumption 1, and that  $s(x, y_1) \leq s(x, y_2)$  holds for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $y_1 \leq y_2$ . Then  $p_{j,i}$  defined as (14) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P} \{ p_{j,i} \leq \alpha \text{ and } Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \} \leq \alpha,$$

for any  $1 \leq j \leq M$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}$ .

Note that the standard choice of score  $s(x, y) = y - \widehat{\mu}(x)$  satisfies the monotonicity condition. Alternatively, one can consider a direct extension of the p-value (9) as follows:

$$p_{j,i} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i} \leq \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}, Y_{k,i} \leq C_{k,i} \right\} + 1}{K+1}, \quad \forall j \in [M], i \in [N_{K+j}]. \quad (15)$$

The validity of the above  $p_{j,i}$  is ensured by applying Proposition 1 with the score  $\tilde{s}(x, y) = s(x, c(x)) \mathbb{1}\{y \leq c\} + \infty \mathbb{1}\{y > c(x)\}$ , which is monotone with respect to  $y$ . Based on these observations, an intuitive option for the selection with FDR control is to apply the BH procedure to  $p_{j,i}$ s from (14) or (15), but as before, the resulting procedure is not guaranteed to control the FDR theoretically, because of the complex dependence structure and the fact that we are testing a random number of hypotheses.

Instead, we discuss below the e-value counterpart to the above p-value(s), and propose a theoretically valid procedure. For any  $j \in [M]$  and  $i \in [N_{K+j}]$ , let us define

$$e_{j,i} = \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j^+ \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'} < T_j^-, Y_{k,i'} \leq C_{k,i'} \right\} + 1} \cdot (K+1), \quad (16)$$

where

$$T_j^+ = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^+(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where}$$

$$\widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^+(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'} < t, Y_{k,i'} \leq C_{k,i'} \right\} + 1}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l \neq j} N_{K+l}}{K+1}, \quad (17)$$

and

$$T_j^- = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^-(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where}$$

$$\widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^-(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'} < t, Y_{k,i'} \leq C_{k,i'} \right\}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l \neq j} N_{K+l}}{K+1}, \quad (18)$$

for a predefined  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ . The following theorem proves that the above  $e_{j,i}$  is a valid conditional e-value for the null  $H_{j,i}$ , and therefore, applying the e-BH procedure to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  ensures cFDR control, and therefore FDR control.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose the hierarchical data  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_K, \tilde{Z}_{K+1}, \dots, \tilde{Z}_{K+M}$  satisfies Assumption 1. Then the statistic  $e_{j,i}$  defined as (16) is an e-value for  $H_{j,i}$ , conditional on  $N_{K+1:K+M}$ . Consequently, the e-BH procedure, applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  defined by (16) at level  $\alpha$ , controls the cFDR at level  $\alpha$ .*

---

**Algorithm 2:** Selection of hierarchical data with hierarchical conformal e-values

---

**Input:** Calibration data  $(X_{k,i}, Y_{k,i})_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$ , Score function  $s : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , Test inputs  $(X_{k,i})_{K+1 \leq k \leq K+M, 1 \leq i \leq N_k}$ , Cutoff function  $c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , Target level  $\alpha$ , Parameter for threshold  $\tilde{\alpha}$ .

**Step 1:** Compute  $C_{k,i} = c(X_{k,i})$  and  $\widehat{V}_{k,i} = s(X_{k,i}, C_{k,i})$  for  $k \in [K+M]$  and  $i \in [N_k]$ .

**Step 2:** Compute  $T_j^+$  and  $T_j^-$  according to (17) and (18), respectively, for  $j \in [M]$ .

**Step 3:** Compute the e-values  $e_{j,i}$  according to (16) for  $j \in [M]$  and  $i \in [N_{K+j}]$ .

**Step 4:** Sort the e-values:  $e_{(1)} \geq e_{(2)} \geq \dots \geq e_{(n_{\text{test}})}$ , where  $n_{\text{test}} = \sum_{k=K+1}^{K+M} N_k$ .

**Step 5:** (e-BH procedure): Compute  $l^* = \max \left\{ l \in [n_{\text{test}}] : \frac{le_{(l)}}{n_{\text{test}}} \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \right\}$ .

**Output:** Selection set  $\mathcal{R} = \{(j, i) : e_{j,i} \geq e_{(l^*)}\}$ .

---

We provide the proof of Theorem 2 in Appendix A.4 and summarize the complete procedure in Algorithm 2. The hierarchical conformal e-value-based procedure utilizes all the information in the calibration set, and thus provides stable results.

As in the subsampling-based method, one can boost the e-values by dividing them by a superuniform random variable. Again, to avoid introducing external randomness, we could obtain such a random variable using internal randomness as discussed in Remark 3. We will illustrate the performance of both the basic and boosted procedures through simulations in the next section.

## 4 Extensions

In this section, we discuss extensions of the proposed selection procedures to more general settings. Section 4.1 considers the task of jointly testing hypotheses at the group and individual levels; Section 4.2 addresses the case where the group covariate distribution shifts between the calibration and test sets; and Section 4.3 applies the proposed methods to the task of selection based on individual treatment effect.

### 4.1 Procedure for joint inference on the groups and the individuals

We now explore the task where our objective extends beyond testing hypotheses at individual levels to include the selection of groups across different layers. For example, in drug discovery, one might be

interested in selecting both individual drugs and drug classes. Suppose we also aim to test group-level hypotheses  $\{H_j : j = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$ , in addition to the individual level hypotheses  $H_{j,i}$ 's. For example, one can consider the following types of group-level hypotheses:

- (1) Group-global null:  $H_j : Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \forall j \in [N_{K+j}]$ ,
- (2) Selecting groups with large mean:  $H_j : \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} Y_{K+j,i} \leq c$ .

We aim to construct a selection procedure that controls the group size-conditional FDR, which is now defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cFDR} &= \mathbb{E}[\text{FDP} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}], \\ \text{where FDP} &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{(j,i) \in \mathcal{R}\} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} + \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{j \in \mathcal{R}\} \mathbb{1}\{H_j\}}{|\mathcal{R}| \vee 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{R} \subset \{(j,i) : j = 1, \dots, M, i = 1, \dots, N_{K+j}\} \cup \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  denotes the rejection set.

We note that if we are interested in testing only the group-level hypotheses with marginal FDR control, we can simply apply the BH procedure with conformal p-values—as described in [Jin and Candès \[2023b\]](#)—constructed by treating each group as a single observation. Testing the individual-level hypotheses can be based on the results from the previous sections. However, jointly testing both group-level and individual-level hypotheses requires additional consideration, as we need group size-conditional e-values for the group-level hypotheses to maintain FDR control. Below, we discuss methods for the construction of valid e-values for the group level nulls.

#### 4.1.1 Special case: selection with group-global nulls

Suppose we are interested in testing  $H_j$ 's together with the group-global nulls

$$H_j : Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \quad \forall i \in [N_{K+j}]$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$ . For this goal, we can construct an e-value simply by averaging the individual level e-values in the group.

$$e_j = \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i}, \quad \text{where } e_{j,i} \text{ is defined as (7)}. \quad (20)$$

Applying the result in the proof of Theorem 1, we can demonstrate that  $e_j$  is a valid e-value conditional on the group size  $N_{K+j}$ , thus ensuring that the e-BH procedure applied to both  $e_{j,i}$ 's and  $e_j$ s controls the conditional FDR. We rigorously state this result in the following proposition and offer the proof in Appendix A.5.

**Proposition 2.** *The e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  from (7) and  $(e_j)_{1 \leq j \leq M}$  from (20) at level  $\alpha$  guarantees  $\text{cFDR} \leq \alpha$ .*

**Remark 5** (Comparison with e-filter). *The e-filter framework, studied in [Gablenz and Sabatti \[2024\]](#), provides a method for controlling both the individual-level and group-level false discovery rates, for group-global nulls. In contrast, the procedure we discuss above controls the overall FDR instead of the individual and group-level FDRs. However, since the threshold  $T_j$  (8) is determined based on the FDP estimate, the individual-level FDR is also likely controlled below the target  $\alpha$ . We illustrate this empirically in the next section.*

#### 4.1.2 Selection with general group null hypotheses

Next, we consider a more general setting where the null hypothesis  $H_j$  can be a condition about any function of the outcome vector of the  $(K+j)$ -th group  $(Y_{K+j,1}, Y_{K+j,2}, \dots, Y_{K+j,N_{K+j}})$ . For conciseness, let us write

$$\tilde{X}_k = (X_{k,1}, X_{k,2}, \dots, X_{k,N_k}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Y}_k = (Y_{k,1}, Y_{k,2}, \dots, Y_{k,N_k}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^2 \cup \dots$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{Y} \cup \mathcal{Y}^2 \cup \dots$ . Now suppose we are interested in testing

$$H_j : h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j}), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, M,$$

where  $\tilde{c} : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is the target cutoff function and  $h : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  denotes the function of interest, e.g.,  $h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}) = \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} Y_{K+j,i}$ , if we are interested in selecting groups with large mean values. We write  $C_{K+j} = \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j})$ .

Now we construct the test statistic for  $H_j$ . Similarly to the construction of  $e_{j,i}$  for individual level hypotheses, we first construct a ‘group score’ function  $s_g : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  independently of the calibration data, and write  $\hat{V}_k^r = s_g(\tilde{X}_k, C_k)$ ,  $\forall k \in [K+M]$ . Again, we construct the score  $s_g$  in the way that a smaller value of  $\hat{V}_{K+j}^r$  can be viewed as stronger evidence against  $H_j$ .

Next, let

$$I_{\geq r} = \{k \in [K] : N_k \geq r\}, \quad r = 1, 2, \dots$$

and

$$\hat{V}_k^r = s_g(\tilde{X}_k^r, \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_k^r)), \quad \text{for } r \leq N_k, \quad \text{where } \tilde{X}_k^r = (X_{k,1}, X_{k,2}, \dots, X_{k,r}).$$

Observe that  $I_{\geq r}$  denotes the set of all groups with size at least  $r$ , and that for such groups, the  $\hat{V}_k^r$ s are exchangeable. As a remark,  $\hat{V}_k^r$  can be constructed using a randomly chosen set of  $r$  data points from the group, rather than the first  $r$  points as described above.

Then we define

$$e_j = \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\hat{V}_{K+j} < T_j\}}{\sum_{k \in I_{\geq N_{K+j}}} \mathbb{1}\{\hat{V}_k^{N_{K+j}} < T_j, h(\tilde{Y}_k^{N_{K+j}}) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_k^{N_{K+j}})\} + 1} \cdot |I_{\geq N_{K+j}} + 1|, \quad (21)$$

where  $T_j$  is defined as

$$T_j = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}^{N_{K+j}}(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \quad \text{where} \\ \widehat{\text{FDP}}^r(t) = \frac{\sum_{k \in I_{\geq r}} \mathbb{1}\{\hat{V}_k^r < t, h(\tilde{Y}_k^r) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_k^r)\} + 1}{1 \vee \sum_{l=1}^M \mathbb{1}\{\hat{V}_{K+l} \leq t\}} \cdot \frac{M}{|I_{\geq r}| + 1}, \quad \text{for } r \geq 1. \quad (22)$$

The parameter  $\tilde{\alpha}$  above may differ from the one used to construct the individual level e-values. Intuitively, the e-value  $e_j$  is constructed by comparing the group score  $\hat{V}_{K+j}$  with the scores of groups with the same size, and the group null  $H_j$  is rejected if the score is significantly smaller than the scores of the groups with similar size. We prove that  $e_j$  (21) is a valid conditional e-value for  $H_j$  in the following theorem, with the proof deferred to Appendix A.6.

**Theorem 3.** *The statistic  $e_j$  defined as (21) is an e-value for  $H_j$  conditional on  $N_{K+1:K+M}$ . Consequently, the e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  from (7) and  $(e_j)_{1 \leq j \leq M}$  from (21) at level  $\alpha$  controls the cFDR (19) at level  $\alpha$ .*

By Theorem 3, the procedure controls the overall FDR that accounts for both the group-level and the individual-level hypotheses, while the individual-level FDR and the group-level FDR are also likely controlled at the target level  $\alpha$ . This is because the thresholds  $T_j$  in (8) and (22) are determined using estimates of the individual-level and group-level FDP, respectively. We illustrate this with experiments in the next section.

## 4.2 Inference under group-covariate shift

In this section, we discuss the setting where we have a group-covariate shift, meaning that the test group features  $G_{K+1}, \dots, G_{K+M}$  are drawn from a distribution  $\tilde{P}_G$ , potentially distinct from  $P_G$ . For example, the test groups may be drawn with selection procedure depending on the group features, leading to a group-covariate distribution that is different from the calibration set.

For simplicity, we explicitly assume the following model.

$$\begin{aligned} G_1, G_2, \dots, G_K &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_G, & G_{K+1}, \dots, G_{K+M} &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \tilde{P}_G \\ N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{K+M} &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_N, \\ Z_{k,1}, Z_{k,2}, \dots, Z_{k,N_k} &| G_k, N_k \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{Z|G} \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, K+M, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we do not observe  $Y_{k,i}$  for  $K+1 \leq k \leq K+M$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N_k$ . Let  $w(x) = \frac{d\tilde{P}_G(x)}{dP_G(x)}$  represent the likelihood ratio between  $\tilde{P}_G$  and  $P_G$ , and we assume it is known. Leveraging the weighted conformal inference scheme proposed by Tibshirani et al. [2019], we construct the e-values by properly weighting the calibration data.

Here, we only discuss the extension of subsampling conformal e-values to the weighted case; the hierarchical conformal e-values can be extended in a similar fashion. The weighted subsampling conformal e-values are constructed as follows. For any  $j \in [M]$  and  $i \in [N_{K+j}]$ ,

$$e_{j,i}^w = \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j^w \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k^j \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < T_j^w, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + p_{K+j}^j}, \text{ where } p_k^j = \frac{w(G_k)}{\sum_{l=1}^K w(G_l) + w(G_{K+j})},$$

and  $i_k^*$  is the index of the randomly drawn observation in the  $k$ -th group as in (6). Here, the threshold  $T_j^w$  is defined as

$$T_j^w = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^w(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where}$$

$$\widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^w(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k^j \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < t, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + p_{K+j}^j \cdot \frac{\sum_{l=1}^M N_{K+l}}{K+1}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t \right\}}. \quad (24)$$

We prove that applying the e-BH procedure with the above likelihood ratio-weighted test statistics controls the FDR. The proof can be found in Appendix A.7.

**Theorem 4.** *Under model (23), the e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i}^w)_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  from (7) at level  $\alpha$  guarantees  $\text{cFDR} \leq \alpha$ .*

### 4.3 Selection based on individual treatment effects

In this section, we consider a concrete application arising from causal inference: we are to extend the selection procedure to the problem of selecting test points based on their individual treatment effects (ITEs) [Lei and Candès, 2021, Jin et al., 2023]. To set the stage, we follow the potential outcomes framework [Imbens and Rubin, 2015], assuming that each unit is associated with two potential outcomes, one under treatment and one without. Specifically, we consider the setting where samples are drawn as in (1), with  $Z_{k,i} = (X_{k,i}, Y_{k,i}(1), Y_{k,i}(0)) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , where  $Y_{k,i}(1)$  and  $Y_{k,i}(0)$  denote the counterfactual outcomes with and without treatment. We assume that we only observe  $(X_{k,i}, A_k, Y_{k,i})$  for each individual, where  $Y_{k,i} = (1 - A_k)Y_{k,i}(0) + A_k Y_{k,i}(1)$ , and that treatment is assigned groupwise independently of the data, i.e.,

$$A_1, \dots, A_K \mid (\tilde{Z}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq K} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(p_A),$$

for some  $p_A \in (0, 1)$ .

Suppose we have  $K$  treatment groups and  $M$  control groups—we are conditioning everything on the treatment assignments. Without loss of generality, we may assume  $A_1 = \dots = A_K = 1$  and  $A_{K+1} = \dots = A_{K+M} = 0$ . Now, we consider the task of selecting individuals in the control groups whose individual treatment effect  $Y_{K+j,i}(1) - Y_{K+j,i}(0)$  exceeds certain threshold  $c$ . For conciseness, we describe the procedure for the case when  $c = 0$ ; the extension to a general  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  is straightforward.

For this task, the corresponding hypotheses can be written as

$$H_{j,i} : Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, M, i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{K+j}. \quad (25)$$

Compared to the original problem (2), this can be viewed as a setting where the threshold  $C_{k,i} = Y_{k,i}(0)$  is unobserved for each calibration point. Therefore, the procedure from the previous section cannot be directly applied to this setting. However, a similar approach can still be adopted to achieve FDR control, as we describe below.

Given a score function  $s : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let us write  $\widehat{V}_{k,i}^0 = s(X_{k,i}, Y_{k,i}(0))$  and  $\widehat{V}_{k,i}^1 = s(X_{k,i}, Y_{k,i}(1))$ , for  $k \in [K+M]$  and  $i \in [N_k]$ . For example, one can construct a function  $\widehat{\mu} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  using the training set such that  $\widehat{\mu}(X_{k,i})$  estimates  $Y_{k,i}(1)$ , and then define  $s(x, y) = y - \widehat{\mu}(x)$ . Note that we only have access to  $\widehat{V}_{k,i}^1$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $\widehat{V}_{k,i}^0$  for  $K+1 \leq k \leq K+M$ . Throughout this section, we assume that the score function satisfies the following monotonicity condition.

**Assumption 2.** *For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $y_1 \leq y_2$ , it holds that  $s(x, y_1) \leq s(x, y_2)$ .*

**Subsampling conformal e-values for ITEs.** We first consider generalizing the subsampling approach. Suppose we draw  $i_1^*, \dots, i_K^*$  as in (6). The subsampling conformal p-value for  $H_{j,i}$  (25) can be constructed as

$$p_{j,i} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 > \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*}^1 \right\} + 1}{K+1}. \quad (26)$$

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $p_{j,i}$  defined as (26) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P} \{ p_{j,i} \leq \alpha \text{ and } Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0) \} \leq \alpha,$$

for any  $1 \leq j \leq M$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}$ .

For completeness, we provide the proof of Proposition 3 in Appendix A.8. Again, it is not guaranteed that the BH procedure applied to the p-values above controls the FDR. For a theoretically valid procedure, we construct the subsampling conformal e-value as follows.

$$e_{j,i} = \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 < T_j \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*}^1 < T_j \right\} + 1} \cdot (K+1), \quad \forall j \in [M], i \in [N_{K+j}], \quad (27)$$

where

$$T_j = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*}^1 < t \right\} + 1}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'}^0 < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l=1}^M N_{K+l}}{K+1}, \quad (28)$$

for a predefined  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ . Under the monotonicity condition of the score function, it can be shown that the  $e_{j,i}$  above is a valid e-value for  $H_{j,i}$ , as stated in the following theorem. The proof of Theorem 5 is delegated to Appendix A.9.

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then  $e_{j,i}$  from (27) is an e-value for  $H_{j,i}$  (25), conditional on  $N_{K+1:K+M}$ . Consequently, the e-BH procedure, applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  defined by (27) at level  $\alpha$ , controls the cFDR at level  $\alpha$ .*

**Hierarchical conformal e-values for ITEs.** Next, we generalize the hierarchical conformal e-value. Similar to the previous case, we construct the e-value based on two stopping times:

$$e_{j,i} = \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 < T_j^+ \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < T_j^- \right\} + 1} \cdot (K+1), \quad \forall j \in [M], i \in [N_{K+j}], \quad (29)$$

where

$$T_j^+ = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^+(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^+(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < t \right\} + 1}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'}^0 < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l \neq j} N_{K+l}}{K+1},$$

and

$$T_j^- = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^-(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^-(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < t \right\}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'}^0 < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l \neq j} N_{K+l}}{K+1},$$

for a predefined  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ . The following theorem shows that when the score function is nondecreasing in  $y$ , the hierarchical conformal e-value defined in (29) is a valid conditional e-value for  $H_{j,i}$ . The proof of Theorem 6 is presented in Appendix A.10.

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then  $e_{j,i}$  from (29) is an e-value for  $H_{j,i}$  (25), conditional on  $N_{K+1:K+M}$ . Consequently, the e-BH procedure, applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  defined by (29) at level  $\alpha$ , controls the cFDR at level  $\alpha$ .*

We conclude this section by noting that the proposed procedures can be extended to the setting where the treatment assignment is dependent on the covariates, using a weighting strategy as discussed in Section 4.2.

## 5 Simulations

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the proposed procedures in a variety of simulation settings.<sup>1</sup> Section 5.1 and 5.2 investigate the selection of individuals, with subsampling conformal e-value and the hierarchical conformal e-values, respectively. Section 5.3 focuses on selecting both groups and individuals, and Appendix B.1 presents simulation results on selection based on individual treatment effects.

**Data-generating process.** Throughout this section, the data is generated from the following data-generating process:

$$\begin{aligned} G &\sim \text{Unif}([-5, 5])^{p_G}, \\ N &\sim 2 + \text{Poisson}(\lambda), \\ X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N \mid G, N &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N_p(AG, 3 \cdot I_p), \\ Y_i \mid X_i, G_i, N_i &\sim N(\beta_1^\top X_i + \log |\beta_2^\top G|, \sigma^2 \cdot \|X\|/p), \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where we set the dimensions of the group-specific covariates and the individual-specific covariates to be  $p_G = 10$  and  $p = 20$ , respectively. The parameters  $\beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $\beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_G}$  are generated by drawing each component from a uniform distribution, and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p_G}$  is generated by drawing each entry from a standard normal distribution (once generated, they are fixed throughout the repetitions). We consider the task of selecting individuals whose outcome values exceed  $c = 20$ , i.e., we test  $H_{j,i} : Y_{j,i} \leq 20$ .

### 5.1 Selecting individuals with subsampling conformal e-values

We first explore the performance of e-BH applied to subsampling conformal e-values (Algorithm 1) under different group number/size settings. We set  $\sigma = 1$  and consider three scenarios of group size distributions: (1)  $\lambda = 0$ , (2)  $\lambda = 5$ , and (3)  $\lambda = 10$ .

**Implementation details.** In our simulation,  $K_{\text{train}} = 100$  groups of training data are generated. We then use random forest regression to construct an estimator  $\hat{\mu} : \mathbb{R}^{p_G} \times \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  that takes both the group-specific covariates and the individual-specific covariates as inputs; based on  $\hat{\mu}$ , the score function is constructed as  $s(g, x, y) = y - \hat{\mu}(g, x)$ . We repeat the following steps 500 times, reporting the averaged results.

In each trial, we generate a calibration data with  $K = 200$  groups and a test set with  $M$  groups, where we conduct the experiment with three different choices of  $M$ : 20, 50, and 200. Then we run the proposed procedure in Algorithm 1, as well as the p-value-based procedure given by (10), at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, 0.1, \dots, 0.25$ . For the e-value construction, we take the threshold level  $\tilde{\alpha} = 0.9\alpha$ . We additionally apply the U-eBH procedure with the boosted e-values (13), as described in Section 3.1. We compute the false discovery proportion and the empirical power of the two procedures in each trial, and then calculate their average to obtain the estimates of the FDR and the power.

**Results.** The estimated FDR and power, along with their standard errors, are shown in Figure 3 and 4, respectively. In all settings, our proposed method (Algorithm 1) controls the FDR as desired. The boosted version shows a slight improvement in terms of power, where the improvement becomes negligible for  $K$  large enough. It is also worth noting that e-BH behaves almost identically to the p-value-based method, while the latter does not have theoretical FDR control; the difference seems to diminish as  $K$  increases.

<sup>1</sup>Code to reproduce the experiments is available at [https://github.com/yhoon31/selection\\_hierarchical](https://github.com/yhoon31/selection_hierarchical).






Figure 3: Estimated false discovery rates of Algorithm 1 (e-BH with subsampling conformal e-values), its boosted version (U-eBH with subsampling conformal e-values), and p-BH (10), across various group size settings and test sizes, with standard errors, at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, \dots, 0.25$ . The dotted line corresponds to the  $y = x$  line.




Figure 4: Estimated power of Algorithm 1 (e-BH+subsampling conformal e-values), its boosted version (U-eBH+subsampling conformal e-values), and p-BH (10) across different group size settings and test sizes, with standard errors, at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, \dots, 0.25$ .

## 5.2 Selecting individuals with hierarchical conformal e-values

Next, we demonstrate the experimental results for the method based on hierarchical conformal e-values. Specifically, we explore the performance of the following methods for comparison:

- (1) The e-BH procedure applied to the hierarchical conformal e-values (Algorithm 2).
- (2) Algorithm 2 with boosting, i.e., the U-eBH procedure applied to the hierarchical conformal e-values.
- (3) BH procedure applied to the hierarchical conformal p-values (14).
- (4) BH procedure applied to the  $p_{j,i}$ 's defined in (15).

Recall that the first two methods using e-values have a theoretical guarantee for FDR control, while the remaining two methods do not. The results of p-value-based methods are provided as a reference, as p-values often demonstrate strong empirical performance across many problems, despite lacking theoretical guarantees.

We generate the data as in the previous experiments in Section 5.1, with  $\lambda = 5$  and test group sizes of 50, under different within-group variances  $\sigma = 1, 5, \text{ and } 10$ . We repeat the process 500 times and report the averaged results, as well as the standard errors.

**Results.** A summary of the results is shown in Figure 5, which demonstrate that selection using hierarchical conformal e-values, along with its boosted version, successfully controls the FDR at the desired levels. The procedure using the hierarchical conformal p-value (14) tends to be overly conservative, showing zero power in every trial. The procedure with  $p_{j,i}$  values from (15) tends to tightly control the FDR, but its FDR occasionally exceeds the target level.

Figure 6 compares the hierarchical conformal e-value-based method with the subsampling conformal e-value-based method. Overall, the procedure with hierarchical conformal e-values tends to be more conservative and less powerful compared to the procedure with subsampling conformal e-values. In other words, if we view e-value-based methods as a ‘correction’ of p-value-based methods, the subsampling strategy provides a tighter, minimal correction that yields less conservative results.

This result suggests a tradeoff between the randomness of the procedure and its power: the subsampling conformal e-value introduces additional randomness in the within-group selection step but achieves higher power, whereas the hierarchical conformal e-value reduces randomness at the cost of power. The choice of procedure may depend on the primary focus of the user.




Figure 5: Estimated false discovery rate and power of Algorithm 2 (e-BH+hierarchical conformal e-values), its boosted version (U-eBH+hierarchical conformal e-values), as well as the p-BH procedure applied to hierarchical conformal p-values (14) (p-BH (1)) and (15) (p-BH (2)), across different within-group variances, at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, \dots, 0.25$ .




Figure 6: Estimated false discovery rate and power of Algorithm 1 (e-BH+subsampling conformal e-values) and Algorithm 2 (e-BH+hierarchical conformal e-values), across different within-group variances, with standard errors, at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, \dots, 0.25$ .

### 5.3 Selecting both groups and individuals

Next, we investigate the performance of the procedure for selecting both the groups and the individuals. We first examine the selection with group-global nulls. The data is generated as in (30), with  $\lambda = 5$ , and we run the procedure as described in Section 4.1.1. We present the results for test group sizes of 20, 50, and 200. Figure 7 illustrates the overall FDR that the procedure aims to control, as well as the group-FDR and individual-FDR, which are computed using only the group level nulls and the individual level nulls, respectively. The results indicate that the overall FDR is controlled as proved in Proposition 2; moreover, the FDR within each level (group and individual) is also controlled fairly well.

Next, we examine the selection procedure for the case where the group nulls are given in the form of

$$H_j : \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} Y_{K+j,i} \leq c, \quad (31)$$

which means we select groups with sufficiently large average outcomes. We run the procedure as described in Section 4.1.2, in two settings:

- (1) Setting 1 (constant group size) :  $N = 10$  almost surely,
- (2) Setting 2 (heterogeneous group size) :  $N \sim 2 + \text{Poisson}(5)$ .

Figure 8 and 9 show the results for Setting 1 and Setting 2, respectively. Here, we see a similar story: the overall FDR is controlled as desired, and the group-FDR and individual-FDR are also well-controlled.

## 6 Real data application

### 6.1 ACS income data

We further illustrate the performance of the proposed procedure by applying it to the ACS income dataset [Ding et al., 2021]. This dataset consists of observations of U.S. adults across 50 states. We consider an outcome that is a binary variable indicating whether an individual's yearly income exceeds 50,000 dollars; the features form a 10-dimensional vector that includes demographic and job information for each individual. In the experiment, we focus the observations from California, which includes 195,665 data points and consider the task of identifying individuals with an income exceeding 50,000 dollars, i.e.,  $Y = 1$ .




Figure 7: The false discovery rate and power of the joint selection procedure for individual nulls and group-global nulls at different test group sizes (20, 50, and 200) and levels.




Figure 8: The false discovery rate and power of the joint selection procedure for individual nulls and group nulls (31) in Setting 1, at different test group sizes (20, 50, and 200) and levels.




Figure 9: The false discovery rate and power of the joint selection procedure for individual nulls and group nulls (31) in Setting 2, at different test group sizes (20, 50, and 200) and levels.

We apply the pre-trained model from Liu et al. [2023], which uses XGBoost, to a split of the data consisting of 50,000 observations to construct the estimator  $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$  for  $\mathbb{P}\{Y = 1 \mid X = \cdot\}$  and define the score function  $s(x, y) = y - \hat{\mu}(x)$ . We then stratify the remaining split of 145,565 observations based on three variables: class of worker, relationship, and occupation, retaining only the groups with at least 10 observations. This results in 858 groups, from which we construct a calibration set consisting of 650 groups and a test set of 200 groups.

As in the simulations, we compare the performance of three procedures: the proposed procedure with subsampling conformal e-values, its boosted procedure, and the procedure with subsampling conformal p-values. We repeat these procedures with 500 sets of samples drawn from the groups according to (6), at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, 0.1, \dots, 0.25$ . The results are shown in Figure 10. Note that we have only one set of realized data, and the plot shows the means of the FDP and empirical power—equivalently, the data-conditional FDR and power—while the procedure provides marginal FDR control. These results are provided to illustrate the overall performance of the method, though they do not exactly represent the theoretical target. Figure 10 show that such data-conditional FDR is also well-controlled.




Figure 10: Results for ACS income data, with 500 trials. The dotted line corresponds to the  $y = x$  line.

## 6.2 Blood pressure control data

We also explore the performance of the individual-treatment-effect-based procedure discussed in Section 4.3, on the blood pressure control dataset [Ogedegbe et al., 2018]. This dataset comprises samples

of patients, including their demographic information (e.g., age, gender) and clinical measurements (e.g., BMI, cardiovascular risk assessment); the outcome variable is systolic blood pressure (SBP). The patients are assigned to one of two treatment groups: public health insurance coverage (HIC), or HIC combined with a nurse-led task-shifting intervention (TASSH). The task considered in this experiment is to identify individuals for whom the TASSH strategy results in a greater reduction in SBP compared to the baseline HIC strategy. In other words, letting  $Y(1)$  denote the reduction under TASSH and  $Y(0)$  under HIC, our aim is to test hypothesis of the form (25) for each individual.

The original data were collected from 32 health centers, resulting in a hierarchical structure. We excluded observations with missing information. After this step, the dataset consists of 389 samples from 29 groups, with an average group size of approximately 14. For evaluation purposes, we artificially generate the counterfactual outcomes. We split the data into training, calibration, and test sets, with group sizes of 5, 20, and 4, respectively. Using the observations in the training data, we employ random forest regression with 11 covariates, comprising demographic and clinical measurements, to construct an estimator function  $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$ , and a residual-score function  $s(x, y) = y - \hat{\mu}(x)$ . We then apply the e-BH procedure as well as its boosted version to the subsampling conformal e-values computed as (27), as described in Section 4.3. We repeat the procedure for 500 independent trials of subsampling, at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, 0.1, \dots, 0.4$ . The results are presented in Figure 11.




Figure 11: Results for blood pressure control data, with 500 trials. The dotted line corresponds to the  $y = x$  line.

## 7 Discussion

In this work, we provide predictive selection procedures with FDR control in settings where the data has a hierarchical structure. Our procedures are based on the e-BH method, where we construct valid e-values in two ways: subsampling conformal e-values and hierarchical conformal e-values. The subsampling-based method involves extra randomness but tends to more tightly control the FDR and achieve higher power empirically; the hierarchical conformal e-value-based method is more stable, but also exhibits conservativeness empirically. We also introduce procedures for selecting both groups and individuals with overall FDR control, while tending to control FDR at both the group and individual levels.

Many open questions remain. For example, one might aim for group feature-conditional FDR control, considering that data with a hierarchical structure inherently contains information about the group-conditional distribution of the scores. Can we achieve such a stronger target in a distribution-free sense? Another question is whether it would be possible to extend the procedure to settings with more complex within-group data structures, such as time series or vectors of multiple outcomes for each group. Since the subsampling method only exploits between-group exchangeability, there may be room for further extensions, and we leave these questions for future work.

## Acknowledgment

Z.R. is supported by NSF grant DMS-2413135. Y.L. is supported in part by NIH R01-AG065276, R01-GM139926, NSF 2210662, P01-AG041710, R01-CA222147, ARO W911NF-23-1-0296, NSF 2046874,

ONR N00014-21-1-2843, and the Sloan Foundation.

## References

- Jiahao Ai and Zhimei Ren. Not all distributional shifts are equal: Fine-grained robust conformal inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13042*, 2024.
- Anastasios N Angelopoulos and Stephen Bates. A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07511*, 2021.
- Anastasios N Angelopoulos, Rina Foygel Barber, and Stephen Bates. Theoretical foundations of conformal prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11824*, 2024.
- Rina Foygel Barber, Emmanuel J Candes, Aaditya Ramdas, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Predictive inference with the jackknife+. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(1):486–507, 2021.
- Rina Foygel Barber, Emmanuel J Candes, Aaditya Ramdas, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Conformal prediction beyond exchangeability. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2):816–845, 2023.
- Meshi Bashari, Amir Epstein, Yaniv Romano, and Matteo Sesia. Derandomized novelty detection with fdr control via conformal e-values. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Stephen Bates, Emmanuel Candès, Lihua Lei, Yaniv Romano, and Matteo Sesia. Testing for outliers with conformal p-values. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(1):149 – 178, 2023. doi: 10.1214/22-AOS2244. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-AOS2244>.
- Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*, 57(1): 289–300, 1995.
- Emmanuel Candès, Lihua Lei, and Zhimei Ren. Conformalized survival analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(1):24–45, 2023.
- Maxime Cauchois, Suyash Gupta, Alnur Ali, and John C Duchi. Robust validation: Confident predictions even when distributions shift. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–66, 2024.
- Suresh Dara, Swetha Dhamercherla, Surender Singh Jadav, CH Madhu Babu, and Mohamed Jawed Ahsan. Machine learning in drug discovery: a review. *Artificial intelligence review*, 55(3):1947–1999, 2022.
- Frances Ding, Moritz Hardt, John Miller, and Ludwig Schmidt. Retiring adult: New datasets for fair machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:6478–6490, 2021.
- Edgar Dobriban and Mengxin Yu. Symmpi: Predictive inference for data with group symmetries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16160*, 2023.
- Allan Donner, Neil Klar, and Neil S Klar. *Design and analysis of cluster randomization trials in health research*, volume 27. Arnold London, 2000.
- John C Duchi, Suyash Gupta, Kuanhao Jiang, and Pragya Sur. Predictive inference in multi-environment scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16336*, 2024.
- Robin Dunn, Larry Wasserman, and Aaditya Ramdas. Distribution-free prediction sets for two-layer hierarchical models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–12, 2022.
- Lasse Fischer and Aaditya Ramdas. An online generalization of the e-bh procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.20683*, 2024.
- Paula Gablenz and Chiara Sabatti. Catch me if you can: signal localization with knockoff e-values. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, page qkae042, 2024.
- Peter Grünwald, Rianne de Heide, and Wouter Koolen. Safe testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 86(5):1091–1128, 03 2024. ISSN 1369-7412. doi: 10.1093/jrsssb/qkae011. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrsssb/qkae011>.



- Yu Gui, Rina Foygel Barber, and Cong Ma. Distributionally robust risk evaluation with an isotonic constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06867*, 2024a.
- Yu Gui, Ying Jin, and Zhimei Ren. Conformal alignment: Knowing when to trust foundation models with guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10301*, 2024b.
- Zijian Guo. Statistical inference for maximin effects: Identifying stable associations across multiple studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(547):1968–1984, 2024.
- Julian PT Higgins, Simon G Thompson, and David J Spiegelhalter. A re-evaluation of random-effects meta-analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 172(1):137–159, 2009.
- Nikolaos Ignatiadis, Ruodu Wang, and Aaditya Ramdas. Compound e-values and empirical bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19812*, 2024a.
- Nikolaos Ignatiadis, Ruodu Wang, and Aaditya Ramdas. E-values as unnormalized weights in multiple testing. *Biometrika*, 111(2):417–439, 2024b.
- Guido W Imbens and Donald B Rubin. *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge university press, 2015.
- Yujin Jeong and Dominik Rothenhäusler. Calibrated inference: statistical inference that accounts for both sampling uncertainty and distributional uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11886*, 2022.
- Yujin Jeong and Dominik Rothenhäusler. Out-of-distribution generalization under random, dense distributional shifts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18370*, 2024.
- Ying Jin and Shan Ba. Toward optimal variance reduction in online controlled experiments. *Technometrics*, 65(2):231–242, 2023.
- Ying Jin and Emmanuel J Candès. Model-free selective inference under covariate shift via weighted conformal p-values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09291*, 2023a.
- Ying Jin and Emmanuel J Candès. Selection by prediction with conformal p-values. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(244):1–41, 2023b.
- Ying Jin and Zhimei Ren. Confidence on the focal: Conformal prediction with selection-conditional coverage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03868*, 2024.
- Ying Jin, Zhimei Ren, and Emmanuel J Candès. Sensitivity analysis of individual treatment effects: A robust conformal inference approach. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(6): e2214889120, 2023.
- Kevin L Keys, Angel CY Mak, Marquitta J White, Walter L Eckalbar, Andrew W Dahl, Joel Mefford, Anna V Mikhaylova, María G Contreras, Jennifer R Elhawary, Celeste Eng, et al. On the cross-population generalizability of gene expression prediction models. *PLoS genetics*, 16(8):e1008927, 2020.
- Junu Lee and Zhimei Ren. Boosting e-bh via conditional calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17562*, 2024.
- Yonghoon Lee, Rina Foygel Barber, and Rebecca Willett. Distribution-free inference with hierarchical data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06342*, 2023.
- Yonghoon Lee, Edgar Dobriban, and Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen. Simultaneous conformal prediction of missing outcomes with propensity score  $\epsilon$ -discretization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04613*, 2024a.
- Yonghoon Lee, Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen, and Edgar Dobriban. Batch predictive inference, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.13990>.
- Li-wei Lehman, Mohammed Saeed, William Long, Joon Lee, and Roger Mark. Risk stratification of icu patients using topic models inferred from unstructured progress notes. In *AMIA annual symposium proceedings*, volume 2012, page 505. American Medical Informatics Association, 2012.
- Lihua Lei and Emmanuel J Candès. Conformal inference of counterfactuals and individual treatment effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83(5):911–938, 2021.

- Ziyi Liang, Matteo Sesia, and Wenguang Sun. Integrative conformal p-values for out-of-distribution testing with labelled outliers. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, page qkad138, 2024.
- Jiashuo Liu, Tianyu Wang, Peng Cui, and Hongseok Namkoong. On the need for a language describing distribution shifts: Illustrations on tabular datasets. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023.
- Yi Liu, Alexander W Levis, Sharon-Lise Normand, and Larry Han. Multi-source conformal inference under distribution shift. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09331*, 2024.
- Yuan Liu, Ayush Jain, Clara Eng, David H Way, Kang Lee, Peggy Bui, Kimberly Kanada, Guilherme de Oliveira Marinho, Jessica Gallegos, Sara Gabriele, et al. A deep learning system for differential diagnosis of skin diseases. *Nature medicine*, 26(6):900–908, 2020.
- Ariane Marandon, Lihua Lei, David Mary, and Etienne Roquain. Adaptive novelty detection with false discovery rate guarantee. *The Annals of Statistics*, 52(1):157–183, 2024.
- Nicolai Meinshausen and Peter Bühlmann. Maximin effects in inhomogeneous large-scale data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(4):1801 – 1830, 2015. doi: 10.1214/15-AOS1325. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/15-AOS1325>.
- David M Murray. *Design and analysis of group-randomized trials*, volume 29. Monographs in Epidemiology and, 1998.
- Gbenga Ogedegbe, Jacob Plange-Rhule, Joyce Gyamfi, William Chaplin, Michael Ntim, Kingsley Apusiga, Juliet Iwelunmor, Kwasi Yeboah Awudzi, Kofi Nana Quakyi, Jazmin Mogaverro, et al. Health insurance coverage with or without a nurse-led task shifting strategy for hypertension control: A pragmatic cluster randomized trial in ghana. *PLoS medicine*, 15(5):e1002561, 2018.
- Harris Papadopoulos. Inductive conformal prediction: Theory and application to neural networks. In *Tools in artificial intelligence*. IntechOpen, 2008.
- Aaditya Ramdas and Ruodu Wang. Hypothesis testing with e-values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23614*, 2024.
- Aaditya K. Ramdas, Rina F. Barber, Martin J. Wainwright, and Michael I. Jordan. A unified treatment of multiple testing with prior knowledge using the p-filter. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2790 – 2821, 2019. doi: 10.1214/18-AOS1765. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOS1765>.
- Zhimei Ren and Rina Foygel Barber. Derandomised knockoffs: leveraging e-values for false discovery rate control. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 86(1):122–154, 2024.
- Dominik Rothenhäusler, Nicolai Meinshausen, Peter Bühlmann, and Jonas Peters. Anchor regression: Heterogeneous data meet causality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83(2):215–246, 2021.
- Glenn Shafer. Testing by betting: A strategy for statistical and scientific communication. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 184(2):407–431, 2021.
- Glenn Shafer and Vladimir Vovk. A tutorial on conformal prediction. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(3), 2008.
- Harvineet Singh, Vishwali Mhasawade, and Rumi Chunara. Generalizability challenges of mortality risk prediction models: A retrospective analysis on a multi-center database. *PLoS Digital Health*, 1(4): e0000023, 2022.
- David Stutz, Abhijit Guha Roy, Tatiana Matejovicova, Patricia Strachan, Ali Taylan Cemgil, and Arnaud Doucet. Conformal prediction under ambiguous ground truth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09302*, 2023.
- Fangzhou Su and Peng Ding. Model-assisted analyses of cluster-randomized experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83(5):994–1015, 2021.

- Ryan J Tibshirani, Rina Foygel Barber, Emmanuel Candes, and Aaditya Ramdas. Conformal prediction under covariate shift. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Vladimir Vovk. Transductive conformal predictors. In *Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations: 9th IFIP WG 12.5 International Conference, AIAI 2013, Paphos, Cyprus, September 30–October 2, 2013, Proceedings 9*, pages 348–360. Springer, 2013.
- Vladimir Vovk and Ruodu Wang. E-values: Calibration, combination and applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1736–1754, 2021.
- Vladimir Vovk, Alexander Gammerman, and Glenn Shafer. *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, volume 29. Springer, 2005.
- Bingkai Wang, Fan Li, and Mengxin Yu. Conformal causal inference for cluster randomized trials: model-robust inference without asymptotic approximations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01977*, 2024a.
- Bingkai Wang, Chan Park, Dylan S Small, and Fan Li. Model-robust and efficient covariate adjustment for cluster-randomized experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–13, 2024b.
- Ruodu Wang and Aaditya Ramdas. False discovery rate control with e-values. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(3):822–852, 2022.
- Joseph L Watson, David Juergens, Nathaniel R Bennett, Brian L Trippe, Jason Yim, Helen E Eisenach, Woody Ahern, Andrew J Borst, Robert J Ragotte, Lukas F Milles, et al. De novo design of protein structure and function with rfdiffusion. *Nature*, 620(7976):1089–1100, 2023.
- Ying Xiong, Xue Shi, Shuai Chen, Dehuan Jiang, Buzhou Tang, Xiaolong Wang, Qingcai Chen, and Jun Yan. Cohort selection for clinical trials using hierarchical neural network. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 26(11):1203–1208, 2019.
- Ziyu Xu and Aaditya Ramdas. More powerful multiple testing under dependence via randomization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11126*, 2023.

# Appendix

## A Technical proofs

### A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Let  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{eBH}}$  denote the rejection set obtained from applying the e-BH procedure to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$ . Following the proof steps of Wang and Ramdas [2022], we have deterministically that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FDP} &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ e_{j,i} \geq \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^M N_{K+\ell}}{\alpha |\mathcal{R}_{\text{eBH}}|}, H_{j,i} \right\}}{|\mathcal{R}_{\text{eBH}}| \vee 1} \\ &\leq \alpha \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i} \mathbb{1} \{H_{j,i}\}}{\sum_{j=1}^M N_{K+j}}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Taking the expectation of both sides of (32) conditional on  $N_{K+1:K+M}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cFDR} &= \mathbb{E}[\text{FDP} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \leq \alpha \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i} \mathbb{1} \{H_{j,i}\}}{\sum_{j=1}^M N_{K+j}} \mid N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\sum_{j=1}^M N_{K+j}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \mathbb{1} \{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{\sum_{j=1}^M N_{K+j}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} 1 = \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality applies the condition (5).

### A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

We first define an ‘‘oracle’’ FDP estimate

$$\widetilde{\text{FDP}}_{j,i}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < t, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < t, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \in [M], l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l=1}^M N_{K+l}}{K+1},$$

and the corresponding stopping time

$$\tilde{T}_{j,i} = \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widetilde{\text{FDP}}_{j,i}(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}.$$

Next, we show that  $T_j = \tilde{T}_{j,i}$  holds if  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j$  and  $Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}$ . Observe that  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) = \widetilde{\text{FDP}}_j(t)$  for any  $t > \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}$ , provided that  $Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}$  holds. Fix any  $\epsilon > 0$ . By definition of  $T_j$ , if  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j$ , then there exists  $\max\{T_j - \epsilon, \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}\} < t < T_j$  such that  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) \leq \alpha$ . Since  $t > \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}$ , this implies  $\widetilde{\text{FDP}}_j(t) \leq \alpha$ , and consequently  $\tilde{T}_{j,i} \geq t > T_j - \epsilon$ . As this holds for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have  $\tilde{T}_{j,i} \geq T_j$ . Therefore, the condition  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j$  implies  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}$ , allowing us to apply analogous arguments to derive  $T_j \geq \tilde{T}_{j,i}$ . Consequently, we have  $T_j = \tilde{T}_{j,i}$ .

Based on the above observation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \mathbb{1} \{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < T_j, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + 1} \cdot (K+1) \mathbb{1} \{Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < T_j, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\} + 1} \cdot (K+1) \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j \right\} \mathbb{1} \{Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i} \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\}} + 1 \cdot (K+1) \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j \right\} \mathbb{1} \left\{ Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\} \middle| N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\}} + 1 \cdot (K+1) \middle| N_{K+1:K+M} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the within-group and between-group exchangeability, we have that the subsamples

$$(X_{1,i_1^*}, Y_{1,i_1^*}), \dots, (X_{K,i_K^*}, Y_{K,i_K^*}), (X_{K+j,i}, Y_{K+j,i})$$

are exchangeable (and are independent of the group sizes). Also note that  $\tilde{T}_{j,i}$  is invariant with respect to arbitrary permutations on these subsamples, so for any  $k \in [K]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\}} + 1 \middle| N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\}} + \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}} \middle| N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\}} + \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}} \middle| N_{K+1:K+M} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} [e_{j,i} \mathbb{1} \{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\
&\leq \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\}} + \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}} \middle| N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*} \right\}} + \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\}} \middle| N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&\leq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by Lemma 1, the e-BH procedure applied to  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, q \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$  controls the cFDR.

### A.3 Proof of Proposition 1

The proof follows the arguments used in the proof for hierarchical conformal prediction [Lee et al., 2023]. Fix any  $1 \leq j \leq m$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}$ . We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P} \{p_{j,i} \leq \alpha \text{ and } Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\} \\
&= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ V_{k,i'} \leq \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} \right\}}{K+1} \leq \alpha \text{ and } Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ V_{k,i'} \leq V_{K+j,i} \right\}}{K+1} \leq \alpha \right\} \quad \text{since } \widehat{V}_{K+j,i} \geq V_{K+j,i} \text{ if } Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i} \text{ holds} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ V_{k,i} \leq V_{K+j,i} \right\}}{K+1} \leq \alpha \right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ V_{K+j,i} \leq Q'_\alpha \left( \sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \frac{1}{(K+1)N_k} \delta_{V_{k,i'}} \right) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where we define  $Q'_\alpha(P) = \sup\{x : \mathbb{P}_{X \sim P}\{X \leq x\} \leq \alpha\}$  for a distribution  $P$ . Now let us write  $q = Q'_\alpha\left(\sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \frac{1}{(K+1)N_k} \delta_{V_{k,i'}}\right)$ , and observe that  $q$  is invariant to the permutation of  $(V_{K+j,1}, \dots, V_{K+j, N_{K+j}})$ . Therefore, by the exchangeability of  $(V_{K+j,1}, \dots, V_{K+j, N_{K+j}})$  (conditional on  $N_{K+j}$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{V_{K+j,i} \leq q \mid N_{K+j}\} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{V_{K+j,i} \leq q\} \mid N_{K+j}] = \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{V_{K+j,i'} \leq q\} \mid N_{K+j}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{V_{K+j,i'} \leq q\} \mid N_{K+j}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by marginalizing with respect to  $N_{K+1}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{V_{K+j,i} \leq q\} = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{V_{K+j,i'} \leq q\}\right].$$

Next, observe that  $q$  also invariant with respect to group-level permutations, i.e., any permutation of  $(\tilde{V}_1, \dots, \tilde{V}_K, \tilde{V}_{K+j})$ , where  $\tilde{V}_k = (V_{k,1}, \dots, V_{k,N_k})$ . Therefore, by the between-group exchangeability of the data, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{V_{K+j,i'} \leq q\}\right] &= \frac{1}{K+1} \sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1}\{V_{k,i'} \leq q\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \frac{1}{(K+1)N_k} \mathbb{1}\{V_{k,i'} \leq q\}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by the definition of  $Q'_\alpha$ , we have  $\sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \frac{1}{(K+1)N_k} \mathbb{1}\{V_{k,i'} \leq q\} \leq \alpha$  deterministically—observe that the supremum in the definition of  $Q'_\alpha$  is equivalent to maximum for discrete distributions.

Therefore, putting everything together, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{p_{j,i} \leq \alpha \text{ and } Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{V_{K+j,i} \leq q\} = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \frac{1}{(K+1)N_k} \mathbb{1}\{V_{k,i'} \leq q\}\right] \leq \alpha.$$

## A.4 Proof of Theorem 2

As in the proof of Theorem 1, we shall define an “oracle” stopping time that is invariant to permutations within and across groups, and then connect  $T_j^+$  and  $T_j^-$  to it. To start, we define for each  $j \in [M]$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_j &= \sup\left\{t \in \mathbb{R} : \widetilde{\text{FDP}}_j(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha}\right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widetilde{\text{FDP}}_j(t) &= \frac{\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i'} < t, Y_{K+j,i'} \leq C_{K+j,i'}\} + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i'} < t, Y_{k,i'} \leq C_{k,i'}\}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l \neq j} N_{K+l}}{K+1}. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to see that  $\tilde{T}_j$  is invariant to the permutations of  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_K$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{K+j}$ . Next, observe that  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^-(t) \leq \widetilde{\text{FDP}}_j(t) \leq \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j^+(t)$  for any  $t$ , implying  $T_j^+ \leq \tilde{T}_j \leq T_j^-$ . Now, let  $N_{-(K+j)} = (N_{K+l})_{l \neq j}$ . Note also that  $e_{j,i}$  is independent of  $N_{K+j}$  conditional on  $N_{-(K+j)}$ , by the construction of  $T_j^+$  and  $T_j^-$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{-(K+j)}] &= \mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\ &= \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{E}[e_{j,i'} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i'}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i'} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i'}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since the  $e_{j,i}$ 's have the same distribution for  $1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}$ . Since all terms in the above equation are constants—which are equal to the first term—after conditioning on  $N_{-(K+j)}$ , this also implies

$$\mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i'} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i'}\} \mid N_{-(K+j)}\right]. \quad (33)$$

Therefore, by applying  $T_j^+ \leq \tilde{T}_j \leq T_j^-$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i'} < T_j^+, Y_{K+j,i'} \leq C_{K+j,i'}\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i'} < T_j^-, Y_{k,i'} \leq C_{k,i'}\} + 1} \mid N_{-(K+j)}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i'} < \tilde{T}_j, Y_{K+j,i'} \leq C_{K+j,i'}\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i'} < \tilde{T}_j, Y_{k,i'} \leq C_{k,i'}\} + 1} \mid N_{-(K+j)}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i'} < \tilde{T}_j, Y_{K+j,i'} \leq C_{K+j,i'}\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i'} < \tilde{T}_j, Y_{k,i'} \leq C_{k,i'}\} + \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i'} < \tilde{T}_j, Y_{K+j,i'} \leq C_{K+j,i'}\}} \mid N_{-(K+j)}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{K+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since  $\tilde{T}_j$  is invariant with respect to permutations of  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_K$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{K+j}$ , which are exchangeable and are independent of  $N_{-(K+j)}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \leq 1.$$

The second claim follows directly from Lemma 1.

## A.5 Proof of Proposition 2

By the result of Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e_j \mathbb{1}\{H_j\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i} \mathbb{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i=1}^{N_{K+j}} H_{j,i}\right\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right] \leq \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} e_{j,i'} \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i'}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right] \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$ . Therefore,  $e_1, \dots, e_M$  are e-values conditionally on the group sizes  $N_{K+1:K+M}$ , and thus the e-BH procedure that includes  $e_1, \dots, e_M$  controls the conditional FDR.

## A.6 Proof of Theorem 3

It is sufficient to show that  $e_j$  defined as (21) is an e-value for  $H_j$ , conditional on  $N_{K+j}$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_j &= \sup\left\{t \in \mathbb{R} : \widetilde{\text{FDP}}_j^{N_{K+j}}(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha}\right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widetilde{\text{FDP}}_j^r(t) &= \frac{\sum_{k \in I_{\geq r}} \mathbb{1}\left\{\widehat{V}_k^r < t, h(\tilde{Y}_k^r) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_k^r)\right\} + \mathbb{1}\left\{\widehat{V}_{K+j}^r < t, h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}^r) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j}^r)\right\}}{1 + \sum_{l \neq j} \mathbb{1}\left\{\widehat{V}_{K+l} < t\right\}} \cdot \frac{M}{|I_{\geq r}| + 1} \end{aligned}$$



Applying arguments similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we have  $T_j = \tilde{T}_j$  on the event  $\{\widehat{V}_{K+j}^{N_{K+j}} < T_j, h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j})\}$ . Therefore, for any  $r \geq 1$ , letting  $N_{-(K+j)} = (N_{K+l})_{l \neq j}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [e_j \mathbb{1}\{H_j\} \mid N_{K+j} = r, N_{-(K+j)}] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j} < T_j\}}{\sum_{k \in I_{\geq r}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_k^r < T_j, h(\tilde{Y}_k^r) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_k^r)\} + 1} \times (|I_{\geq r}| + 1) \times \mathbb{1}\{h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j})\} \mid N_{K+j} = r, N_{-(K+j)} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j} < \tilde{T}_j\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j} < T_j\}}{\sum_{k \in I_{\geq r}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_k^r < \tilde{T}_j, h(\tilde{Y}_k^r) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_k^r)\} + \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j} < \tilde{T}_j, h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j})\}} \times (|I_{\geq r}| + 1) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbb{1}\{h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j})\} \mid N_{K+j} = r, N_{-(K+j)} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j} < \tilde{T}_j\}}{\sum_{k \in I_{\geq r}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_k^r < \tilde{T}_j, h(\tilde{Y}_k^r) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_k^r)\} + \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j} < \tilde{T}_j, h(\tilde{Y}_{K+j}) \leq \tilde{c}(\tilde{X}_{K+j})\}} \cdot (|I_{\geq r}| + 1) \mid N_{K+j} = r, N_{-(K+j)} \right] \\
&\leq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since  $\{(\tilde{X}_k^r, \tilde{Y}_k^r) : k \in I_{\geq N_{K+j}}\} \cup \{(\tilde{X}_{K+j}, \tilde{Y}_{K+j})\}$  are conditionally exchangeable given  $N_{K+j} = r$  and  $N_{-K+j}$ , and  $\tilde{T}_j$  is invariant with respect to their permutations. Therefore,  $e_j$  is a conditional e-value given  $N_{K+j}$ , as desired.

## A.7 Proof of Theorem 4

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we define the oracle stopping time that is invariant to permutations within and across groups. For each  $j \in [M]$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{T}_{j,i}^w &= \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_{j,i}^w(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where} \\
\widehat{\text{FDP}}_{j,i}^w(t) &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k^j \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < t, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*}\} + p_{K+j}^j \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < t, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+l,i'} < t\}} \\
&\quad \times \frac{\sum_{l=1}^M N_{K+l}}{K+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1, we have  $T_j^w = \tilde{T}_{j,i}^w$  on the event  $\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j^w, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\}$ . Now fix any  $(g_1, z_1), (g_2, z_2), \dots, (g_K, z_K), (g_{K+j}, z_{K+j}) \in \mathcal{G} \times (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$  and let  $\mathcal{E}_g$  denote the event that  $[(G_1, Z_1), \dots, (G_K, Z_K), (G_{K+j}, Z_{K+j})] = [(g_1, z_1), \dots, (g_K, z_K), (g_{K+j}, z_{K+j})]$ , where  $[\cdot]$  denotes a multiset—a set allowing for repeated elements.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [e_{j,i}^w \mathbb{1}\{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < T_j^w, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k^j \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < T_j^w, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*}\} + p_{K+j}^j} \mid N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}^w, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k^j \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}^w, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*}\} + p_{K+j}^j} \mid N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}^w, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K p_k^j \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}^w, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*}\} + p_{K+j}^j} \mid \mathcal{E}_g, N_{K+j} \right] \mid N_{K+1:K+M} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}^w, Y_{K+j,i} \leq C_{K+j,i}\}}{\sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} p_k^j \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k^*} < \tilde{T}_{j,i}^w, Y_{k,i_k^*} \leq C_{k,i_k^*}\}} \mid \mathcal{E}_g, N_{K+j} \right] \mid N_{K+1:K+M} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$\leq 1$ .

Above, the last inequality holds since

$$(G_{K+j}, Z_{K+j}) \mid \mathcal{E}_g, N_{K+1:K+M} \sim \sum_{k \in [K] \cup \{K+j\}} p_k^j \cdot \delta_{(g_k, z_k)}$$

and  $\tilde{T}_{j,i}^w$  depends only on the set  $\{(G_1, Z_1), \dots, (G_K, Z_K), (G_{K+j}, Z_{K+j})\}$  (and  $(\widehat{V}_{K+l,i})_{l \neq j, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+l}}$ ).

Therefore, we have shown that  $e_{j,i}^w$  is a valid group size-conditional e-value for each  $(j, i)$ , and the claim follows directly.

## A.8 Proof of Proposition 3

Observe that by the monotonicity condition, the null event  $Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0)$  implies  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 \leq \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{p_{j,i} \leq \alpha \text{ and } Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0)\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 > \widehat{V}_{k,i_k}^*\} + 1}{K+1} \leq \alpha \text{ and } \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 \leq \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0\right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 > \widehat{V}_{k,i_k}^*\} + 1}{K+1} \leq \alpha\right\} \leq \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step applies the exchangeability of  $\widehat{V}_{1,i_1}^1, \dots, \widehat{V}_{K,i_K}^1, \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1$ .

## A.9 Proof of Theorem 5

In this setting, we define an oracle permutation-invariant stopping time as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{j,i} &= \sup\left\{t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_{j,i}(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha}\right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widehat{\text{FDP}}_{j,i}(t) &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k}^1 < t\} + \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < t\}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+l,i'}^0 < t\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l=1}^M N_{K+l}}{K+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying argument similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we have  $T_j = \tilde{T}_{j,i}$  under the event  $\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 \leq T_j\}$  (but in this case, we do not directly observe the event  $\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 \leq T_j\}$  since  $Y_{K+j,i}(1)$  is not accessible). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[e_{j,i} H_{j,i} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 < T_j\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0)\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k}^1 < T_j\} + 1} \cdot (K+1) \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 < T_j\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0)\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k}^1 < T_j\} + \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < T_j\}} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < T_j\} \cdot (K+1) \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 < \tilde{T}_{j,i}\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0)\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k}^1 < \tilde{T}_{j,i}\} + \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < \tilde{T}_{j,i}\}} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < \tilde{T}_{j,i}, \widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < T_j\} \cdot (K+1) \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < \tilde{T}_{j,i}\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{k,i_k}^1 < \tilde{T}_{j,i}\} + \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < \tilde{T}_{j,i}\}} \cdot (K+1) \mid N_{K+1:K+M}\right] \leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds since  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^0 < T_j$  and  $Y_{K+j,i}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i}(0)$ , implying that  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i}^1 < T_j$  by the monotonicity condition on  $s$ ; the third equality holds by the observation above. The last inequality holds due to the exchangeability of  $(X_{1,i_1^*}, Y_{1,i_1^*}), \dots, (X_{K,i_K^*}, Y_{K,i_K^*}), (X_{K+j,i}, Y_{K+j,i})$  and the invariance of  $\tilde{T}_j$  under arbitrary permutations of these pairs. The next claim follows directly from Lemma 1.

## A.10 Proof of Theorem 6

The proof applies similar ideas as those used in the proofs of Theorem 2 and Theorem 5, where we let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_j &= \sup \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}, \text{ where} \\ \widehat{\text{FDP}}_j(t) &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < t \right\} + \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < t \right\}}{1 \vee \sum_{l \neq j} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+l}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+l,i'}^0 < t \right\}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{l \neq j} N_{K+l}}{K+1}, \end{aligned}$$

for each  $j \in [M]$ . Then we have  $T_j^+ \leq \tilde{T}_j \leq T_j^-$ , and we also have the equality (33) for the e-values  $(e_{j,i})_{1 \leq j \leq M, 1 \leq i \leq N_{K+j}}$ , by applying the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 2.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{K+1} \cdot \mathbb{E} [e_{j,i} \mathbb{1} \{H_{j,i}\} \mid N_{K+1:K+M}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i'}^0 < T_j^+ \right\} \cdot \mathbb{1} \{Y_{K+j,i'}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i'}(0)\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < T_j^- \right\} + 1} \mid N_{-(K+j)} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i'}^0 < \tilde{T}_j \right\} \cdot \mathbb{1} \{Y_{K+j,i'}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i'}(0)\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < \tilde{T}_j \right\} + 1} \mid N_{-(K+j)} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i'}^1 < \tilde{T}_j \right\}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_k} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{k,i'}^1 < \tilde{T}_j \right\} + \frac{1}{N_{K+j}} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_{K+j}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \widehat{V}_{K+j,i'}^1 < \tilde{T}_j \right\}} \mid N_{-(K+j)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{K+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since  $Y_{K+j,i'}(1) \leq Y_{K+j,i'}(0)$  implies  $\widehat{V}_{K+j,i'}^1 \leq \widehat{V}_{K+j,i'}^0$ . Therefore,  $e_{j,i}$  is a valid group size-conditional e-value for  $H_{j,i}$  and applying Lemma 1 completes the proof.

## B Additional simulation results

### B.1 Selection based on individual treatment effects

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the selection procedure based on individual treatment effects, as discussed in Section 4.3. We generate the data as previously, with  $\lambda = 10$  and test group sizes 20, 50, and 200. We compare the performance of procedures using e-values and p-values obtained from subsampling. The results shown in Figure 12, demonstrating that the proposed procedure controls the FDR while closely approximating the p-value-based method.




Figure 12: False discovery rate and power of the selection procedure for the nulls (25) using conformal e-values (27) (e-BH) and its boosted version (U-eBH), along with the procedure using conformal p-values (26), across different test group sizes at levels  $\alpha = 0.05, 0.075, \dots, 0.25$ .