

# Full-conformal novelty detection: A powerful and non-random approach

Junu Lee\*, Ilia Popov, and Zhimei Ren

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

January 7, 2025

## Abstract

We introduce a powerful and non-random methodology for novelty detection, offering distribution-free false discovery rate (FDR) control guarantees. Building on the full-conformal inference framework and the concept of e-values, we introduce *full-conformal e-values* to quantify evidence for novelty relative to a given reference dataset. These e-values are then utilized by carefully crafted multiple testing procedures to identify a set of novel units out-of-sample with provable finite-sample FDR control. Furthermore, our method is extended to address distribution shift, accommodating scenarios where novelty detection must be performed on data drawn from a shifted distribution relative to the reference dataset. In all settings, our method is non-random and can perform powerfully with limited amounts of reference data. Empirical evaluations on synthetic and real-world datasets demonstrate that our approach significantly outperforms existing methods for novelty detection.

**Keywords:** conformal inference; e-values; multiple hypothesis testing

## 1 Introduction

This paper considers the problem of novelty detection: given a pool of new observations, the goal is to identify the ones whose distributions differ from that of a reference dataset (Wilks, 1963; Hawkins, 1980; Riani et al., 2009; Cerioli, 2010). This problem is fundamental in statistics and finds application in numerous domains, such as astronomy (Mary et al., 2020), high-energy physics (Vatanen et al., 2012), proteomics (Shuster et al., 2022; Gao and Zhao, 2023), and fraudulent activity detection (Ahmed et al., 2016). In recent years, with the rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) tools—for example, the advent and subsequent popularity of large language models (LLMs)—there have been new additions to the suite of novelty detection problem domains. We list a couple of relevant examples below.

**Detection of copyright violation.** Suppose a creator suspects that an AI model has been trained on her copyright-protected material (e.g., published books) without permission. To detect such infringements, dataset inference (Maini et al., 2021, 2024) considers a setting where the creator can provide private/unpublished material. Then, one can treat (some function of) the private material as the reference dataset, and detect copyright violation by finding the outliers in the suspect material (as the model would “respond” differently to the data upon which it was trained versus fresh data).

**Detection of model stealing.** Many companies have launched their corresponding production LLMs. Through the respective APIs, users can input a prompt to obtain a response generated by the LLM. These LLMs, however, are prone to *model stealing attacks*: adversarial users can carefully design prompts, collect the corresponding LLM-generated response, and use this prompt-response pairs to train a new model that recovers a nontrivial part of the original one (Tramèr et al., 2016; OpenAI, 2023; Carlini et al., 2024). *Model stealing detection* aims to pick out the adversarial prompts from the benign ones, where the

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: junulee@wharton.upenn.edu

latter conforms to the distribution of the training samples while the former does not (Oliynyk et al., 2023).

In these motivating examples, the data structures are often highly complex, making it extremely challenging to reliably estimate the distribution of the reference data. In this work, we therefore take a model-free perspective, imposing no parametric assumptions on the data-generating process. With access to a reference dataset consisting of i.i.d. samples and a pool of test samples, we aim to design a novelty detection procedure with the objective of effectively detecting the outliers among the test samples while simultaneously controlling the *false discovery rate (FDR)* (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995) at a pre-specified level.

For this task, conformal inference (Vovk et al., 2005) provides a flexible framework for establishing the desired distribution-free guarantees. A prior work by Bates et al. (2023) introduced an FDR-controlling method based on a sample-splitting version of conformal inference. The method proposed therein constructs a *conformal p-value* for each test point, then subsequently applies the *Benjamini–Hochberg (BH)* procedure to the p-values. These conformal p-values are constructed by randomly splitting the reference data into two folds. One fold is used to train a (one-class) classifier; this classifier then scores the test points as well as the reference samples in the remaining fold, and each test score is compared to the reference scores. The sample splitting step, central to the construction, is undesirable since it reduces the number of samples used for training and inference; moreover, it introduces external randomness to the procedure, which leads to unstable outputs and could potentially be exploited to “hack” the results over multiple sample splits.

A follow-up work (Marandon et al., 2024) improves the training step by using a masked version of the full dataset; the external randomness issue, however, remains. Subsequently, Bashari et al. (2024) propose a derandomization scheme, which in general comes with a loss of statistical power. Motivated by these limitations, this work provides a methodology based on the full version of conformal inference, which is (1) deterministic, (2) guaranteed to achieve finite-sample FDR control, and (3) empirically more powerful than existing strategies, especially when the reference dataset is limited.

## 1.1 Preview of our contributions

We present *K-FC ND (K-block full conformal novelty detection)*, a powerful, non-random algorithm that rigorously controls the finite-sample FDR. Our proposal leverages *e-values* (see Ramdas and Wang (2024) for an overview) as the statistical tool for quantifying the evidence of an outlier. In particular, we construct a *full-conformal e-value* for each test point and obtain the selection set by applying the conditionally calibrated e-BH procedure (Wang and Ramdas, 2022; Lee and Ren, 2024) to these e-values. We outline our theoretical and methodological contributions below and summarize the technical comparison between our method and existing methods in Table 1.

**Novelty detection with the full-conformal paradigm.** In contrast to existing methods relying on the split-conformal paradigm, our method is based on the full-conformal paradigm. In our framework, both the model-fitting and inference step make use of all the reference data (and even the test data); it also flexibly allows us to adaptively choose a model-fitting algorithm in a data-driven fashion. Such flexibility is crucial for power of the novelty detection algorithm, especially when the number of reference samples is limited (e.g., the LLM-based problem settings, where annotated data is expensive).

**Ensuring FDR control using full conformal e-values.** One of our major theoretical contributions is proving that *K-FC ND* satisfies finite-sample FDR control. This is challenging because the key property required for FDR control in Bates et al. (2023)—that the conformal p-values are positively correlated—may no longer hold once we step into the full-conformal paradigm. For example, naïvely combining the full-conformal p-values and BH does not ensure FDR control. To circumvent this issue, we completely forgo approaching the problem with p-values. Instead, we construct a set of full-conformal e-values and feed them to the e-BH procedure, which controls the FDR regardless of how the e-values depend on each other.

**Boosting the power of full conformal e-BH.** We also make substantial efforts to boost the power of e-BH on full conformal e-values. First, the full-conformal e-values are delicately designed such that they are close to exhibiting “tight” FDR control via the e-BH procedure, which encourages more rejections by the method. Second, we instantiate (and improve upon) the conditionally calibrated e-BH (e-BH-CC) framework (Lee and Ren, 2024) in the model-free novelty detection setting, which markedly boosts

the empirical power of our procedure while maintaining the FDR control. Finally, we incorporate an e-value-based correction for the proportion of the inliers, thereby achieving tight control of FDR.

**Novelty detection under distribution shift.** Another major technical contribution of this work is to generalize  $K$ -FC ND to a setting where the inliers of the test set experience a (known) distribution shift from the inliers of the reference set. To perform novelty detection in this setting, we propose a weighted variant of  $K$ -FC ND which similarly achieves finite-sample FDR control and demonstrates superior empirical power.

|                        | Finite-sample FDR control | Non-random     | Full data | Weighted | Null prop. adjustable | Adaptive score |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Bates et al. (2023)    | ✓                         | ✗              | ✗         | ✗        | ✓                     | ✗              |
| Marandon et al. (2024) | ✓                         | ✗              | ✓*        | ✗        | ✓                     | ✓              |
| Bashari et al. (2024)  | ✓                         | ✓ <sup>†</sup> | ✓*        | ✗        | ✗                     | ✓              |
| <b>This work</b>       | ✓                         | ✓              | ✓         | ✓        | ✓                     | ✓              |

Table 1: A summarized comparison between our work and existing strategies. For the “Non-random” property, the obelisk (<sup>†</sup>) specifies that the procedure is only fully derandomized when the number of replications is large enough. For the “Full data” property, the asterisk (\*) specifies that the procedure uses a masked version of the full data, losing information in the process.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Two paradigms for conformal prediction and inference

Conformal prediction is a flexible framework for quantifying uncertainty in predictions (Vovk et al., 2005; Shafer and Vovk, 2008; Angelopoulos et al., 2024). Consider a set of i.i.d. training data points  $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$  and an independent test sample  $(X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1})$  drawn from the same distribution. For the test sample, only  $X_{n+1}$  is observed and one wishes to predict  $Y_{n+1}$ . The goal of predictive inference is to construct an interval  $\widehat{C}_n(X_{n+1}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{n+1} \in \widehat{C}_n(X_{n+1})) \geq 1 - \alpha, \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is a pre-specified level and the probability is taken over the randomness of  $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^{n+1}$ .

Leveraging the fact that  $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^{n+1}$  are exchangeable, conformal prediction constructs an interval satisfying (1) by inverting a permutation test. To be concrete, it scores any data point by a function  $\mathcal{S}$ , which takes the sample and a multiset as input and generates a real number:

$$V_i(y) = \mathcal{S}((X_i, Y_i); \mathcal{Z}_{-i} \cup \{(X_{n+1}, y)\}), \quad i \in [n], \quad \text{and} \quad V_{n+1}(y) = \mathcal{S}((X_{n+1}, y); \mathcal{Z}).$$

Above,  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a shorthand for the multiset of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$ , and  $\mathcal{Z}_{-i} := \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{(X_i, Y_i)\}$ ;  $y$  is a hypothesized value of  $Y_{n+1}$ . The score  $V_i(y)$  measures how well  $(X_i, Y_i)$  “conforms” to the multiset, with a large value suggesting nonconformity. One example of such a score function is the residual  $\mathcal{S}((x, y); \mathcal{Z}) = |y - \widehat{\mu}(x)|$ , with  $\widehat{\mu}$  being a prediction function trained on  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Since the resulting nonconformity scores  $V_1(Y_{n+1}), \dots, V_n(Y_{n+1}), V_{n+1}(Y_{n+1})$  are exchangeable, the following prediction set

$$\widehat{C}_n(X_{n+1}) := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R} : V_{n+1}(y) \leq \text{Quantile}\left(1 - \alpha; \{V_i(y)\}_{i \in [n+1]}\right) \right\} \quad (2)$$

achieves the desired guarantee in (1). Above, for a set  $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ ,  $\text{Quantile}(1 - \alpha, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m)$  is the  $\lceil (1 - \alpha)m \rceil$ -th largest element among  $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ . This method, referred to as *full conformal (FC) prediction*, can be computationally expensive—if not intractable—since one needs to check the condition in (2) for every  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

A computationally light alternative to the full conformal prediction is the *split conformal (SC) prediction* (Papadopoulos et al., 2002; Lei et al., 2015). Split conformal prediction alleviates the computation burden by decoupling the model fitting and calibration steps. It splits the labeled data into two disjoint folds  $\mathcal{I}_1$  and  $\mathcal{I}_2$ , and the score function becomes  $\mathcal{S}((x, y); \mathcal{I}_1)$ . For example, we can fit a prediction

function  $\hat{\mu}$  on  $\mathcal{I}_1$  and let  $\mathcal{S}((x, y); \mathcal{I}_1) = |y - \hat{\mu}(x)|$ . Then, for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}_2$ , the nonconformity score  $V_i = \mathcal{S}((X_i, Y_i); \mathcal{I}_1)$ . The prediction set is given by

$$\hat{C}_n(X_{n+1}) := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R} : \mathcal{S}((X_{n+1}, y); \mathcal{I}_1) \leq \text{Quantile}\left(1 - \alpha; \{V_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \cup \{\infty\}\right) \right\}. \quad (3)$$

In the SC prediction set (3), the quantile term no longer depends on  $y$ , and can be efficiently computed. For many commonly used nonconformity scores,  $\hat{C}_n(X_{n+1})$  has simple analytical forms: for example, when  $\mathcal{S}(x, y; \mathcal{I}_1) = |y - \hat{\mu}(x)|$ ,  $\hat{C}_n(X_{n+1}) = \hat{\mu}(X_{n+1}) \pm \text{Quantile}$ .

The SC approach offers a computation shortcut to the FC approach at the price of a reduced sample size for model training and quantile calibration: indeed, if we split the data at a 1:1 ratio, we are left with only half of the data for model training and only half for calibration. Moreover, in SC, the sample splitting step introduces external randomness, which admits the possibility of researchers “hacking” the results by selectively reporting the best result across multiple splits. The two paradigms—SC and FC—therefore present a fundamental tradeoff in conformal prediction. Several attempts have been made to bridge the two approaches (e.g., Barber et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2020; Abad et al., 2022), but these efforts generally involve a relaxation of any guarantees of error control or may require additional assumptions.

## 2.2 Conformal novelty detection

For the model-free novelty detection problem, Bates et al. (2023) propose a method based on *conformal p-values* (Weinstein et al. (2017); Mary and Roquain (2022); Gao and Zhao (2023) introduce an equivalent multiple testing procedure under different terminologies). Their approach is based on the SC paradigm: similar to the prediction set construction task, the reference set is first partitioned into a training fold  $\mathcal{I}_1$  and a calibration fold  $\mathcal{I}_2$ ; the training fold determines the form of the scoring function, with which we assign a nonconformity score to each of the calibration and test points. For the  $j$ -th test point, a split conformal p-value is constructed by contrasting its score with the calibration scores:

$$p_j = \frac{1 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \mathbb{1}\{V_i \geq V_{n+j}\}}{|\mathcal{I}_2| + 1}. \quad (4)$$

Under the null hypothesis  $H_j$  (i.e.,  $Z_{n+j}$  is an inlier),  $V_{n+j}$  is exchangeable with  $\{V_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2}$ . Hence, the rank of  $V_{n+j}$  among  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+j}\}$  is uniform on  $[n+1]$ , leading to the super-uniformity of  $p_j$ . Bates et al. (2023) prove that these SC p-values are *positively regression dependent on a subset (PRDS)*, and by the result of Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001), applying the BH procedure to  $\{p_j\}_{j \in [m]}$  performs novelty detection while ensuring FDR control. This method—referred to as *SC ND*, or *SC BH* to specify that p-values and BH are used—inherits the cons of split conformal prediction: it only uses a subset of the data for training/calibration, and it is intrinsically random.

A follow-up work by Marandon et al. (2024) improves the power of SC ND by making better use of all the given data. Their proposed method, *AdaDetect*, splits the reference data into two folds,  $\mathcal{I}_1$  and  $\mathcal{I}_2$ , as in SC ND. However, it then uses both folds for model fitting: a classifier  $\hat{\mu} : \mathcal{Z} \mapsto [0, 1]$  is trained on  $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}$ , as well as  $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , with the former treated as inliers and the latter outliers. The classifier  $\hat{\mu}$  is then used for scoring the calibration and test points by giving an estimated likelihood of being an outlier, e.g.,  $V_i = \hat{\mu}(Z_i)$ . It is shown in Marandon et al. (2024) that as long as the training process is invariant to the permutation of  $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , the conformal p-values (4) are still valid p-values and satisfy the PRDS property. Compared with SC ND, *AdaDetect* uses partial information in the calibration and test set in the model training step, thereby improving the statistical power, but the issue of randomness remains due to the sample splitting step.

Subsequently, Bashari et al. (2024) propose a remedy to address the randomness issue by taking an e-value perspective. The derandomization scheme establishes the equivalence between SC ND (or *AdaDetect*) and the e-BH procedure (Wang and Ramdas, 2022), then merges different sample splits by averaging the corresponding e-values, finally applying the e-BH procedure to the averaged e-values. The derandomized versions of SC ND and *AdaDetect* stabilize their corresponding original procedures, but are observed to be less powerful than their randomized counterparts.

## 2.3 Related literature

Our work contributes to the literature of model-free novelty detection. In addition to the works introduced in Section 2.2, some authors tackle this problem under different settings. For example, Liang et al. (2022) assume there are labeled outliers in the reference set; Zhao and Sun (2024) suppose that

the hypotheses have some informative structure; Magnani et al. (2024) consider detecting the existence of outliers and providing a lower bound on the number of outliers.

Another closely related line of work, referred to as *Conformal Selection* (Jin and Candès, 2023b,a), considers a slightly different setting where the test set consists of unlabeled units and the goal is to pick out the ones whose labels satisfy a desired pre-specified property. It is worth noting that a recent work (Bai and Jin, 2024) proposes a generalization of the conformal selection procedure, in which a variant also makes use of the full-conformal p-values: although their problem setting, proposed algorithm, and proof techniques are distinct from ours, there turns out to be an elegant connection between a variant of their proposed procedure and a special instance of ours, on which we will elaborate in Section 3.

Our approach to FDR control is based on e-values (Grünwald et al., 2024; Vovk and Wang, 2021; Shafer, 2021; Wasserman et al., 2020) and the e-BH procedure (Wang and Ramdas, 2022). In particular, we construct *compound e-values* (Ignatiadis et al., 2024) for the hypotheses that combine information across different test units and apply the e-BH procedure to obtain an FDR-controlling selection set. To boost the selection power, we leverage the conditional calibration technique as described in Lee and Ren (2024). We adapt their framework, e-BH-CC, in the conformal novelty detection setting, which allows us to make certain improvements in the computational aspect of the method. Notably, in the context of conformal novelty detection, e-BH-CC can be improved to not rely on Monte-Carlo estimation.

### 3 Full-conformal novelty detection

The novelty detection problem setting is formally delineated as follows. We are given a reference dataset of  $n$  observations, or units,  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$  and a test dataset of  $m$  units  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{n+m}\}$ . The reference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  is assumed to have i.i.d. units drawn from some (unknown) distribution  $P$ , while  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  has independently distributed units all with unknown distribution. The goal of novelty detection is to identify which units in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  *do not follow* the distribution  $P$ , i.e., which  $Z_{n+j}$  are outliers in the context of the reference dataset. We write this as a multiple hypothesis testing problem, in which there are  $m$  null hypotheses  $H_1, \dots, H_m$  such that

$$H_j: Z_{n+j} \sim P;$$

i.e., the  $j$ th test unit  $Z_{n+j}$  is an *inlier*. When we reject  $H_j$ , it would be due to having evidence that  $Z_{n+j} \not\sim P$  and is thus an *outlier*. In what follows, we let  $\mathcal{H}_0 := \{j \in [m] : H_j \text{ is true}\}$  denote the set of inliers and  $\mathcal{H}_1 := [m] \setminus \mathcal{H}_0$  the set of outliers. We also use  $\pi_0 = |\mathcal{H}_0|/m$  and  $\pi_1 = 1 - \pi_0$  to denote the fraction of nulls and nonnulls, respectively.

A novelty detection algorithm takes  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  as input, returning a selection set  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [m]$  which indexes the subset of test units seen as outliers by the algorithm. The FDR and power of  $\mathcal{S}$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FDR} &:= \mathbb{E}[\text{FDP}], \text{ where } \text{FDP} := \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbf{1}\{j \in \mathcal{S}\}}{|\mathcal{S}| \vee 1}, \\ \text{Power} &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_1} \mathbf{1}\{j \in \mathcal{S}\}}{|\mathcal{H}_1| \vee 1} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$  and  $|A|$  denotes the cardinality of a set  $A$ . FDP stands for “false discovery proportion”, the fraction of the selection set which were true inliers. The aim is to design a non-random novelty detection algorithm that controls the FDR at a pre-specified  $\alpha$  and achieves high power.

#### 3.1 Novelty detection with full conformal e-values

As a motivating starting point, we first introduce the canonical version of our full conformal novelty detection method, which revolves around scoring each reference and test unit using a nonconformity scoring function  $V(\cdot)$  trained over the *entire dataset*  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , with the requirement that the training procedure is invariant to the order of the training datapoints. Defining the scores  $V_i := V(Z_i)$  for each  $i \in [n+m]$ , we can then construct an e-value  $e_j$  for the hypothesis  $H_j$  as follows:

$$e_j = (n+1) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T\}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T\}}, \quad \forall j \in [m]. \quad (5)$$

As shown in Lee and Ren (2024); Bashari et al. (2024), central to the e-value construction is the threshold  $T$ , which is chosen to guarantee that  $\mathbb{E}_{H_j}[e_j] \leq 1$ , thereby creating valid (and strict) e-values. We define:

$$T = \inf \left\{ t \in \{V_i\}_{i=1}^{n+m} : \frac{m}{n+1} \cdot \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq t\}}{1 \vee \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq t\}} \leq \alpha \right\}. \quad (6)$$

However, the aforementioned works only consider the SC paradigm, where the scoring function  $V(\cdot)$  is trained on a hold-out subset of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  (and the scores are generated with  $V(\cdot)$  and the rest of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ ). In our case, there is no “hold-out” dataset: the function  $V(\cdot)$  is trained using all the data, and the reference scores  $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are generated from using all the reference data. Due to the shift in the conformal paradigm, we find it prudent to state and rigorously prove the validity of  $e_j$  when the full-conformal paradigm is used. The following theorem establishes a stronger result that implies the validity of the e-values constructed using (5), with its proof deferred to Appendix A.1.

**Theorem 1.** *For any  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ , if nonconformity scores  $V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+j}$  are exchangeable conditional on  $\{V_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ , i.e., for any permutation  $\pi$  on  $[n] \cup \{n+j\}$ ,*

$$(V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+j}, \{V_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}) \stackrel{d}{=} (V_{\pi(1)}, \dots, V_{\pi(n)}, V_{\pi(n+j)}, \{V_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}),$$

*then the e-value  $e_j$  constructed using (5) and (6) is a strict e-value, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq 1$ .*

For the canonical full-conformal e-value  $e_j$  defined in (5), we first note that for any  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ ,  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j})$  are exchangeable and independent of  $\{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ . It is straightforward to see that since  $V(\cdot)$  is invariant to the permutation on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ ,  $(V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+j})$  are therefore exchangeable given  $\{V_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ . The condition of Theorem 1 is then satisfied for all  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ , and therefore  $e_j$  is a strict e-value.

As a result of Theorem 1, running the e-BH procedure on the collection  $(e_1, \dots, e_m)$  at the fixed FDR target level  $\alpha$  will result in a rejection set with provably guaranteed FDR control at said level  $\alpha$  (in fact, the FDR is controlled at an even smaller level  $\pi_0 \alpha$ ); this is stated rigorously in the following proposition, with its proof immediately implied by Wang and Ramdas (2022, Theorem 1). We refer to this procedure as *full conformal novelty detection (FC ND)*, and describe it in detail in Algorithm 1.

**Proposition 1.** *The rejection set  $\mathcal{R}$  of FC ND (Algorithm 1) satisfies  $\text{FDR}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \pi_0 \alpha$ .*

---

**Algorithm 1:** Full conformal novelty detection (FC ND) procedure

---

**Input:** Reference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ ; test dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{n+m}\}$ ;  
nonconformity score model  $f$ ; target FDR level  $\alpha$ .

- 1 Train  $V(\cdot) \leftarrow f(\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}})$
- 2 **for**  $i \in [n+m]$  **do**
- 3    $V_i \leftarrow V(Z_i)$ .
- 4 Compute threshold  $T$  using the set of nonconformity scores  $\{V_i\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  as in (6).
- 5 **for**  $j \in [m]$  **do**
- 6   Compute  $e_j$  using  $\{V_i\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  and  $T$  as specified in (5).
- 7  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m)$ , the e-BH procedure at level  $\alpha$ .

**Output:** Rejection set  $\mathcal{R}$ .

---

### 3.1.1 Aside: full-conformal p-values

Due to our primary objective of provably FDR-controlling conformal novelty detection, we make a conscious choice to make e-values and e-BH a focal point of our methodology. However, the FC paradigm can be used to construct conformal *p-values* as well—extending upon the SC p-values (4) put forth by the original conformal novelty detection paper by Bates et al. (2023).

With the same restrictions on the training of the nonconformity scoring function  $V(\cdot)$  (the invariance of  $V$  to the ordering of its constituent training datapoints), we can make FC p-values as follows:

$$p_j = \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq V_{n+j}\}}{n+1} \quad \forall j \in [m].$$

By the exchangeability of  $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{V_{n+j}\}$  under the null hypothesis  $H_j$ ,  $p_j$  is super-uniform and is thus a valid p-value. Moreover, Yang et al. (2021, Theorem 2) proves that applying BH to the FC p-values achieves finite-sample FDR control.

Bai and Jin (2024)—in a different context—also consider the FC p-values, but with a slightly different scoring function. In their construction, for each  $j \in [n+m]$ ,  $V_j = V^{(j)}(Z_j)$ , where  $V^{(j)}$  is a unit-specific nonconformity scoring function trained over  $\{Z_i\}_{i \in [n+m] \setminus \{j\}}$  with its training procedure invariant to its input. Since the scores are trained in a “leave-one-out” (or LOO) fashion, we will call the corresponding p-values the *LOO-FC p-values*. It is again straightforward to see that  $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{V_{n+j}\}$  are exchangeable under  $H_j$ , which implies the validity of  $p_j$ . Bai and Jin (2024, Theorem 2) show that applying BH to LOO-FC p-values achieves finite-sample FDR control.

Interestingly, the FDR-controlling guarantees—of BH applied to either FC or LOO-FC p-values—can be implied by Theorem 1 and Proposition 1, which are taken from the e-value and e-BH perspective. To see this, we note that the rejection set  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{BH}}(p_1, \dots, p_m)$  obtained by applying BH to the p-values (4) at level  $\alpha$  coincides with  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m)$  with the corresponding  $V_i$ ’s, as shown in Lee and Ren (2024, Proposition 8). For both scoring functions, the condition in Theorem 1 is satisfied for all  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ . As a result, the FDR control of  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m)$  is carried over to  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{BH}}(p_1, \dots, p_m)$ , and thus these procedures all coincide for this canonical setting.

As we will see in later sections, the choice of the e-value perspective for the novelty detection problem will be essential for generalizing our method to handle more efficient score functions, mitigate outlier contamination during training, and operate when  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  experiences distribution shift from  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$ . In these more complex cases, p-value-based approaches will not guarantee FDR control through the BH procedure without heavy assumptions or some sort of correction (such as random pruning of the rejection set; see Jin and Candès (2023a); Bai and Jin (2024)). Taking the e-value perspective will allow straightforward generalizations to enable FDR control in these complicated settings—the key feature distinguishing  $K$ -FC ND from prior methods—while still encompassing previous and concurrent methods developed for the current canonical setting.

### 3.2 $K$ -block full conformal novelty detection

One feature of the canonical full conformal novelty detection procedure is that the scoring function  $V$  is trained over both the reference and test datasets, giving the resulting model exposure to both inliers and outliers without their identity. When using ML algorithms suitable for (unsupervised) *outlier detection*, such as the Isolation Forest (Liu et al., 2012) or the local outlier factor algorithm (Breunig et al., 2000), the resulting trained  $V$  can perform well in distinguishing between the outliers and inliers of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ .

On the flip side, when  $V(\cdot)$  is instead trained as a *novelty detection* model (e.g., the one-class SVM), as is typical in the SC paradigm for conformal selection, the “contamination” of the training dataset by the outliers of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  can end up diminishing the quality of nonconformity scores produced by  $V(\cdot)$ . Generally, this is as novelty detection algorithms assume that the training dataset consists only of data from the inlier distribution, learn patterns of the inlier distribution (or, if possible, its support and density), and score the test units based on its conformity to the learned patterns or support. When using such a model for Algorithm 1, the unintended yet expected consequence is that the model will learn “inlier” patterns from  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  as well, thereby scoring said elements as inliers without consideration of the patterns also learned from  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ . Hence, one takeaway is that full-conformal *novelty detection* paradoxically relies on *outlier detection* algorithms in order to leverage the information found in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  in a beneficial manner. The other takeaway is that one must limit the influence of outliers in the test dataset if one desires using novelty detection algorithms—or any other model that is sensitive to overly high outlier contamination in the training set—to construct the nonconformity scores.

To that end, we propose the more general version of the method outlined in Section 3.1, where instead of training a model over  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , we split  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  into  $K$  blocks and only augment the reference set by one block, one at a time. Denoting the partition of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  as  $B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_K = \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , we train a nonconformity scoring function  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  for each block  $k \in [K]$ , where the training is over  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}} \cup B_k$  and invariant to the ordering of the input samples; each of the reference and test units are then scored with  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$ , giving the collection of scores  $\mathcal{V}^{(k)} = \{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]} := \{V^{(k)}(Z_i)\}_{i \in [n+m]}$ . For each  $j \in [m]$ ,  $e_j$  is constructed as per (5) and (6) specifically using the scores  $\mathcal{V}^{(k)}$ , where  $Z_{n+j} \in B_k$ . Note that the

threshold from (6) now depends on  $k$ , induced by  $\mathcal{V}^{(k)}$ . Rewriting the construction rigorously:

$$e_j = (n+1) \cdot \frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}}{1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq T_k\}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $T_k = \inf \left\{ t \in \mathcal{V}^{(k)} : \frac{m}{n+1} \cdot \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq t\}}{1 \vee \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq t\}} \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}$  and  $k: Z_{n+j} \in B_k$ .




Figure 1: A schematic illustration of  $K$ -FC ND.  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ . and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{n+m}\}$ . For each  $k \in [K]$ , the score function  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  is trained over  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}} \cup B_k$  with the training process agnostic to the order of the training datapoints. For each  $Z_{n+j}$  contained in  $B_k$ , the e-value is constructed according to (7) with  $\{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]}$ . Note that, in the specific example above, since  $B_1$  only contains  $Z_{n+1}$  and  $Z_{n+2}$ ,  $V^{(1)}$  is only used to construct the e-values  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ .

Here, we allow the construction of  $T_k$  to use a threshold  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$  that is potentially distinct from the target FDR level  $\alpha$ . Following exactly the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 1, we can show that  $K$ -FC e-values defined in (7) are valid, strict e-values for *any* choice of  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ , given that  $\{V_1^{(k)}, \dots, V_n^{(k)}, V_{n+j}^{(k)}\}$  are exchangeable conditional on  $\{V_{n+\ell}^{(k)}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ . This allows us to use e-BH (at level  $\alpha$ ) on these e-values and guarantee FDR control of the resulting rejection set. We formalize this result below and visualize the workflow of  $K$ -FC ND in Figure 1.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_K$  be a partition of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  into  $K$  blocks. Denote  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  as the non-conformity scoring function trained on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k$ . Assume that for any  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ , where  $Z_{n+j} \in B_k$ , the scores  $V_1^{(k)}, \dots, V_n^{(k)}, V_{n+j}^{(k)}$  are exchangeable given  $\{V_{n+\ell}^{(k)}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ . Then, constructing the e-values  $e_1, \dots, e_m$  as per (7) (using any fixed  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ ), we have  $\mathbb{E}_{H_j}[e_j] \leq 1$  for all  $j \in [m]$ . Hence,  $\text{FDR}(\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m)) \leq \pi_0 \alpha$ .*

To see how Corollary 1 implies the validity of  $K$ -FC e-values (7), note that for any  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$  such that  $Z_{n+j} \in B_k$ , since  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  is invariant to the permutation of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k$  and  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j})$  are exchangeable conditional on  $\{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ ,  $(V_1^{(k)}, \dots, V_n^{(k)}, V_{n+j}^{(k)})$  are exchangeable conditional on  $\{V_{n+\ell}^{(k)}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ . Corollary 1 then applies.

**Remark 1** (The role of  $K$ ). *For our implementation in the experiments of Section 5, the partition of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  into blocks is deterministic. Although one can randomize these blocks, the primary intention is for efficiency. The parameter  $K$  allows our procedure to interpolate between two extreme cases,  $K = 1$  and  $K = m$ . The former case is computationally light since one only needs to fit the model once, but the resulting scores may be suboptimal due to the contaminated training sample. The latter case, on the other hand, offers score functions of higher quality, but is computationally more expensive as it requires  $m$  model fits. Therefore, the choice of  $K$  presents a tradeoff between power and computation. That being*



said, as we shall see in numerical results,  $K$ -FC ND already shows substantial power improvement over existing strategies when  $K$  is small, as long as the outlier detection model used can differentiate outliers and inliers in an unsupervised fashion. Hence, we find that without any randomization of partitions, the method still achieves higher power than SC methods (or other  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$ -splitting methods).

**Extension to adaptive scores.** So far we have required  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  to be trained solely over  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k$  in an order-agnostic fashion. In fact, the training of  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  is also allowed to use  $\mathcal{D}_{-k} := \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} \setminus B_k$  with their identity. Specifically, for any  $k \in [K]$ , we can let  $V^{(k)}(\cdot) = f(\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k, \mathcal{D}_{-k})$ , for some  $f(\cdot, \cdot)$  denoting a nonconformity score model that is invariant to the permutation of its first argument. Since the corresponding nonconformity scores still satisfy the conditions required in Corollary 1, and the validity of the e-values is carried over to this generalized case.

To effectively make use of  $\mathcal{D}_{-k}$ , we can choose the *PU (positive unlabeled) classification* methods as  $f$ , treating  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k$  as the positive samples and  $\mathcal{D}_{-k}$  the unlabeled samples as in Marandon et al. (2024). Moreover, similar to Magnani et al. (2024); Bai and Jin (2024),  $\mathcal{D}_{-k}$  can also be leveraged to perform model selection. To be concrete, given  $L$  candidate models  $f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(L)}$ , we obtain the corresponding nonconformity scoring functions via  $V^{(\ell)} = f^{(\ell)}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k, \mathcal{D}_{-k})$ . For each  $\ell \in [L]$ , we generate a “proxy” rejection set  $\mathcal{R}^{(\ell)}$  by constructing the e-values and applying the e-BH procedure with  $V^{(\ell)}(\cdot)$  as if  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k$  is the reference set and  $\mathcal{D}_{-k}$  the test set. The model is then selected by maximizing the proxy rejection set, i.e.,  $\hat{\ell} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\ell \in [L]} |\mathcal{R}^{(\ell)}|$ . Since  $V^{(\hat{\ell})}(\cdot)$  is again invariant to the permutation on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k$ , the e-values constructed with the corresponding nonconformity scores are valid as a result of Corollary 1.

**$K$ -FC p-values.** The  $K$ -block full conformal paradigm allows us to construct more efficient score functions, and with the  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$ 's, one can naturally obtain the  $K$ -FC p-values as follows. For  $\forall j \in [m]$ ,

$$p_j = \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq V_{n+j}^{(k)}\}}{n+1}, \quad (8)$$

where  $B_k$  is the block to which  $Z_{n+j}$  belongs. The exchangeability among  $V_1^{(k)}, \dots, V_n^{(k)}, V_{n+j}^{(k)}$  ensures the validity of  $K$ -FC p-values. However, as mentioned before, the theoretical FDR control of BH applied to 1-FC p-values is not carried over to the case where  $K \geq 2$ .

We briefly explain the reason. In the proof of FDR control with 1-FC p-values, the key step is to show that the p-values are PRDS on the set of nulls; the result of Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001) then implies that BH has FDR control applied to 1-FC p-values. When  $K \geq 2$ , however, the  $K$ -FC p-values are no longer PRDS. We demonstrate this claim empirically in a simulation setting, in which we apply the BH procedure corrected by Storey’s null proportion estimator (Storey, 2002) to the  $K$ -FC p-values (for  $K = 2, 5, 10$ ). If the  $K$ -FC p-values were indeed PRDS, the resulting selection set would control the FDR due to Storey (2002). However, as we see in Figure 2, this is not the case, thereby invalidating the PRDS property of  $K$ -FC p-values for  $K \geq 2$ .




Figure 2: Empirical FDP of running the BH procedure on  $K$ -FC p-values (8) corrected using Storey’s null proportion estimator, with  $K \in \{2, 5, 10\}$ ,  $\alpha = 0.1$ ,  $m = 200$ ,  $n = 200$ , and the proportion of true outliers  $\pi_1$  varying. The data generating process in Section 5 is followed. If  $K$ -FC p-values were PRDS, the resulting FDR of Storey-BH should be below  $\alpha$ . We see that this is not the case for small  $\pi_1$ ; hence,  $K$ -FC p-values are not PRDS when  $K > 1$ . (10,000 replications for  $K = 2$ ; 5,000 replications for  $K \in \{5, 10\}$ .)

**The LOO- $K$ -FC paradigm.** We can also extend the  $K$ -FC paradigm to the leave-one-out (LOO) framework, where the model which scores unit  $Z_i$  does not see  $Z_i$  during training. To be specific, for each  $k \in [K]$  and any  $i \in [n+m]$ , we can train  $V^{(k,i)}(\cdot)$  over  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k \setminus \{Z_i\}$ , and assign  $V_i^{(k)} = V^{(k,i)}(Z_i)$ . The validity of  $K$ -FC e-values and p-values still holds when replacing the scores with their LOO counterparts. LOO- $K$ -FC ND is however computationally more expensive since it requires fitting the model  $O(m+nK)$  times.

### 3.3 Improving power through e-BH-CC

As our method uses e-BH as the selection procedure, we can boost its power using the e-BH-CC framework developed in Lee and Ren (2024). Central to the instantiation of e-BH-CC is to identify a ‘‘sufficient statistic’’  $S_j$  such that we can sample from  $(e_1, \dots, e_m) \mid S_j$  under  $H_j$ . For the  $K$ -FC e-values, a natural choice of  $S_j$  is  $[\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \{Z_{n+j}\}] \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} \setminus \{Z_{n+j}\}$ , where  $[A]$  denotes a set  $A$  with the order of its elements removed. To see that this is a valid choice, note that conditional on  $S_j = [z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+j}] \cup \{z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j}$ ,

$$(Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j}, \{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j}) \stackrel{H_j}{\sim} \sum_{\pi: \text{permutation on } [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \cdot \delta_{(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)}, z_{\pi(n+j)}, \{z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j})}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\delta_z$  denotes a point mass at  $z$ . With (9), we can in fact sample the data set  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , or any function of the data set, given  $S_j$ .

The boosting method then proceeds as follows. For each  $j \in [m]$ , define the following quantity for any  $c \geq 1$ :

$$\phi_j(c; S_j) := \mathbb{E}_{H_j} \left[ \frac{m \cdot \mathbb{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}} \text{ or } p_j \leq A(c)\}}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}} - e_j \mid S_j \right], \quad (10)$$

where  $p_j$  is the  $K$ -FC p-value defined in (8),  $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m)$ , and  $A(c) \in [0, 1]$  is some data-dependent threshold that is nondecreasing in  $c$ . Here,  $\phi_j(c; S_j)$  can be computed since the quantity inside the expectation is a function of the data, whose distribution is fully known conditional on  $S_j$  under  $H_j$ . We then find the critical value  $\hat{c}_j = \sup\{c \geq 1 : \phi_j(c; S_j) \leq 0\}$ , and define the boosted e-value as

$$e_j^b = \begin{cases} \frac{m}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}} \text{ or } p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_j)\}, & \text{if } \phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) \leq 0; \\ \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}} \text{ or } p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_{j,\ell})\}, & \text{if } \phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) > 0, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where  $\{\hat{c}_{j,\ell}\}_{\ell \geq 1}$  is an increasing sequence such that  $\phi_j(\hat{c}_{j,\ell}; S_j) \leq 0$  and  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \hat{c}_{j,\ell} = \hat{c}_j$ . Finally, we apply e-BH to the boosted e-values  $\{e_1^b, \dots, e_m^b\}$  at level  $\alpha$ , obtaining a selection set  $\mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH-CC}}$ .

Our boosting scheme above is in fact a generalization of the original e-BH-CC framework (Lee and Ren, 2024). In particular, the function  $\phi_j(c; S_j)$  we define in (10) differs from the original version: here, boosting is made possible with the assistance of the  $K$ -FC p-values; in the original version, a multiplicative factor  $c$  is applied to  $e_j$  to enable more rejections. The generalization has many benefits: (1) it allows for boosting even when  $e_j = 0$ , and (2) it to some degree achieves the ‘‘best of both worlds’’ by leveraging both the e-values and p-values. The following proposition rigorously show that the boosted e-values defined through (11) are valid e-values and that the boosted e-values deterministically improve upon the original ones. The proof of Proposition 2 is delegated to Appendix A.2.

**Proposition 2.** *The boosted e-values defined in (11) are valid e-values, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq 1$ , for  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ . Moreover, there is  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1^b, \dots, e_m^b)$ .*

**Computational considerations.** The major computational cost of the boosting scheme comes from calculating the boosted e-values. We discuss several tricks for faster computation. First, for  $\forall j \in [m]$ , evaluating  $\phi_j(c; S_j)$  amounts to taking the average over  $n+1$  points—this is because the quantity inside the expectation in (10) is supported on a set of  $n+1$  elements after conditioning on  $S_j$  (this implies that e-BH-CC can be implemented without Monte-Carlo estimation; the details can be found in Appendix B). Calculating the conditional expectation in (10) requires fitting  $O(nK)$  models.

Second, to obtain  $e_j^b$ , there is no need to search for the critical value  $\hat{c}_j$ , which requires carrying out the evaluation step many times. Instead, it suffices to evaluate  $\phi_j(\cdot; S_j)$  at a specific value  $q_j = \min\{c \geq 1 : p_j \leq A(c)\}$  (we assume the minimum can be attained). It can be shown that the boosted e-values can be written equivalently as

$$e_j^b = \frac{m \mathbb{1}\{\phi_j(q_j; S_j) \leq 0\}}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}}, \quad \forall j \in [m]. \quad (12)$$

The equivalence is rigorously stated and proved in Lemma 1 of Appendix B. Algorithm 3 details the boosted  $K$ -FC ND procedure with the computational shortcuts.

### 3.4 Incorporating null proportion correction for higher power

As an artifact of e-BH, the proposed  $K$ -FC ND procedure controls the FDR by  $\pi_0\alpha$ , where we recall that  $\pi_0$  is the fraction of inliers in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ . Since our FDR target is  $\alpha$ , controlling the FDR at a lower level means we are “wasting” some of our FDR budget, especially when  $\pi_0$  is small.

To fully unleash the power of  $K$ -FC ND, we introduce an estimator for  $\pi_0$  based on Gao (2023) and use it to modify the e-BH-CC procedure, increasing its FDR control level to  $\alpha$ . To construct such an estimator, we work with a potentially different score function  $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$  trained over  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , where the training procedure is invariant to the ordering of input samples. We then assign  $S_i = \mathcal{S}(Z_i)$  for any  $i \in [n+m]$ . Let  $S_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq S_{(n+m)}$  be the order statistics of  $\{S_i\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  and define

$$\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(t) = \frac{n+1}{m} \frac{1 + \sum_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbf{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq t\}}{\mathbf{1}\{S_{n+j} \leq t\} + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}\{S_i \leq t\}}, \quad \forall j \in [m]. \quad (13)$$

The estimator for the null proportion  $\pi_0$  is constructed per hypothesis  $j$ :

$$\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)} = 1 \wedge \hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(S_{(\tau_j)}).$$

Above,  $\tau_j$  is a stopping time of the backwards filtration  $\{\mathcal{G}_k\}_{k \in [n+m]}$ , i.e.,  $\{\tau_j \geq k\} \in \mathcal{G}_k$ , where

$$\mathcal{G}_k := \sigma\left(\sum_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbf{1}\{S_{n+j} \leq S_{(k')}\}, \mathbf{1}\{S_{n+j} \leq S_{(k')}\} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(k')}\}, \forall k' \geq k\right),$$

For example, as proposed in Gao (2023), the stopping time can be taken as

$$\tau_j = \sup\{k \in [n+m] : \hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(S_{(k)}) \geq \hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(S_{(k+1)})\}.$$

As pointed out by Wang and Ramdas (2022), a sufficient condition for e-BH to control the FDR is that  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq m$ , and a set of e-values satisfying this condition are called *compound* e-values by Ignatiadis et al. (2024). When  $e_1, \dots, e_m$  are all valid, strict e-values, we can see that  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq \pi_0\alpha$ , allowing for further tightening of FDR control. The following proposition, however, shows that  $\{e_j/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}\}_{j \in [m]}$  are compound e-values.

**Proposition 3.** *Consider the  $K$ -FC e-values defined in (7) and the null proportion estimators defined in (13). Then  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{E}[e_j/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}] \leq m$ .*

The proof of Proposition 3 is deferred to Appendix A.3. As a consequence of Proposition 3, applying e-BH to  $\{e_j/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}\}$  at level  $\alpha$  controls FDR at level  $\alpha$ . Moreover, following almost the same proof steps of Proposition 2, applying the boosting steps to  $\{e_j/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}\}_{j \in [m]}$  discussed in Section 3.3 controls FDR at level  $\alpha$ .

## 4 Full-conformal novelty detection under distribution shift

Quite often, the assumption that the inlier distributions of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  are the exact same can be called into question. When the reference data is collected in a certain way to guarantee its status as an inlier, or when the inlier data can only be collected from a certain subset of the general population, then the reference inliers and test inliers would not necessarily be alike. For example, consider the problem of detecting which prompts are adversarial for the purpose of LLM model stealing (Section 1). If the reference data (benign prompts) were collected by sampling a subset of individuals from the population and collecting prompts from them, one can expect that these prompts may still look different than the benign prompts sent in a general user. The selection of prompts based on features of the prompter induces a *distribution shift* between  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  and inliers of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ , and the traditional methods originating from Bates et al. (2023) as well as our proposal in Section 3 are no longer valid due to the violation of exchangeability assumptions.

Fortunately, under knowledge of the distribution shift, conformal selection methods can be adapted using the assumption of *weighted exchangeability* (Tibshirani et al., 2019). We show that by taking an

e-value perspective,  $K$ -FC ND can be extended to cover this setting in a straightforward and powerful manner without having to resort to randomness to achieve provable FDR control. Central to the power advantage of this method is the fact that the e-BH-CC framework—detailed in Section 3.3—again improves the power of  $K$ -FC ND.

Formally, denote the two distributions  $P$  and  $Q$  such that  $Z_i \sim P$  for  $i \in [n]$ , while the inliers in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  follow  $Q$ . The distribution shifted can be expressed through the function  $w(z) := dQ/dP(z)$ , the Radon-Nikodym derivative (assuming it exists). The multiple testing problem then attempts to reject a subset of the null hypotheses  $H_j: Z_{n+j} \sim Q$ . Note that when  $w(z) \equiv 1$ , the original problem setting is recovered.

#### 4.1 Weighted $K$ -block full conformal novelty detection

We define the weighted  $K$ -FC e-value underlying  $K$ -FC ND and state the validity of its construction. Like in Section 3.2, we partition  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  into  $K$  blocks  $B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_K$  and train a nonconformity scoring function  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  over  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}} \cup B_k$  for each  $k \in [K]$ . With the resulting collections of scores  $\mathcal{V}^{(k)} = \{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]} := \{V^{(k)}(Z_i)\}_{i \in [n+m]}$ , indexed by  $k$ , we can construct a weighted version of (7) as follows:

$$e_j = \left( w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \right) \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}}{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i \in [n]} w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq T_k\}},$$

$$\text{where } T_k = \inf \left\{ t \in \mathcal{V}^{(k)} : \frac{m}{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)} \cdot \frac{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq t\}}{1 \vee \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq t\}} \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\} \quad (14)$$

and  $k: Z_{n+j} \in B_k$ .

The weighted exchangeability analogue of Theorem 1 states the validity of these e-values.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume under the null  $H_j$ ,  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j}$  exhibit weighted exchangeability with weight function  $w(\cdot)$  in the following manner: conditional on  $\{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j}$ , the joint density of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j}$  satisfies*

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+j}) = w(z_{n+j}) \prod_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} p(z_i),$$

where  $p$  is the density function of distribution  $P$ . Further assume for each  $k \in [K]$  that the scoring function  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  was trained in a way such that it is invariant to the order of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+\ell}$  in the trainset, for each  $\ell: Z_{n+\ell} \in B_k$ . Then the e-value  $e_j$  constructed using (14) is a strict e-value, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq 1$ . Hence,  $\text{FDR}(\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m)) \leq \pi_0 \alpha$ .

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Appendix A.4.

#### 4.2 Applying e-BH-CC to weighted $K$ -FC e-values

In the distribution-shift setting, weighted analogues of conformal p-values have been proposed (Tibshirani et al., 2019; Hu and Lei, 2023; Jin and Candès, 2023a); our  $K$ -block full conformal setting would lead to the p-values

$$p_j = \frac{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq V_{n+j}^{(k)}\}}{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)}.$$

Although marginally superuniform, the collection of p-values  $(p_1, \dots, p_m)$  are not necessarily PRDS, as shown by Jin and Candès (2023a, Proposition 2.4). The BH procedure therefore does not guarantee FDR control (without corrections, such as random pruning of the rejection set (Jin and Candès, 2023a)), inspiring the weighted conformal e-value approach in the SC paradigm (Lee and Ren, 2024). However, the authors found that the weighted versions of SC BH and SC e-BH were no longer equivalent, and that the former often outperformed the latter in terms of power. Hence, the e-BH-CC framework was applied to close this power gap. We also find in our context that the p-value and e-value approaches are no longer equivalent—even when  $K = 1$ —and similarly implement the e-BH-CC framework to boost the power of weighted  $K$ -FC e-BH. The resulting weighted  $K$ -FC e-BH-CC procedure performs similar to or better than the guarantee-less  $K$ -FC BH; see Figure 9.

The implementation of the e-BH-CC framework for the distribution shift setting is exactly the same as that of the default novelty detection problem—outlined in Section 3.3—except we must account

for the relaxation of the exchangeability property to weighted exchangeability. Again taking  $S_j = [\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \{Z_{n+j}\}] \cup \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} \setminus \{Z_{n+j}\}$ , note that conditional on  $S_j = [z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+j}] \cup \{z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j}$ , we have

$$(Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j}, \{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j}) \stackrel{H_j}{\sim} \sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{S}_{[n] \cup \{n+j\}}} \frac{w(z_{\pi(n+j)})}{n! \cdot \sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} w(z_{\pi(i)})} \cdot \delta_{(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)}, z_{\pi(n+j)}, \{z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j})},$$

where  $\mathbb{S}_{[n] \cup \{n+j\}}$  is the permutation group on  $[n] \cup \{n+j\}$ . Algorithm 4 details the exact implementation of weighted  $K$ -FC ND with conditional calibration, with similar computational tricks discussed in Section 3.3.

## 5 Numerical experiments

We compare the performance of FC and SC ND methods in terms of power and FDR control through simulations and a real-data analysis. Throughout the section, we will use the shorthand FC/SC and BH/e-BH/e-BH-CC to specify the underlying multiple testing procedure used for novelty detection. For example, “1-FC e-BH-CC” specifies the method 1-FC ND using e-BH-CC.

### 5.1 Simulations for novelty detection

**Setting and hyperparameters.** To demonstrate the efficacy of  $K$ -FC ND, we borrow the simulation setup of Bates et al. (2023); Jin and Candès (2023a); Lee and Ren (2024), which mimics a cluster-based outlier generating process. At the very beginning, we sample  $n_W$  i.i.d. draws from  $\text{Unif}([-3, 3]^{d_W})$  to attain an initial set of points in  $d_W$ -dimensional space; intuitively, these serve as our cluster centers. Denote this set as  $\mathcal{W}$ ; it will be fixed for *all* experiments. We then generate  $Z_i$  for each  $i \in [n+m]$  as follows. Sample  $W_i \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{W})$  and  $L_i \sim \mathcal{N}_{d_W}(0, I)$ . For each  $i \in [n]$ , construct  $Z_i = L_i + W_i$ . Finally, for each  $j \in [m]$ ,

$$Z_{n+j} = \begin{cases} L_{n+j} + W_{n+j} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{H}_0; \\ \sqrt{a}L_{n+j} + W_{n+j} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{H}_1; \end{cases}$$

where  $a \geq 1$  is a hyperparameter governing the signal strength of the outliers. Hence, the inliers are standard multivariate Gaussian around the points in  $\mathcal{W}$ , while the outliers are likewise multivariate Gaussian around these cluster centers but have larger spread. One can expect that for moderate to large values of  $d_W$  and  $n_W$ , detecting outliers by understanding and estimating the inlier density (without any parametric knowledge) is difficult when the reference dataset is limited.

**Two specific setups: “small-sample” and fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  size.** For both the default setting as well as the distribution shift setting, we will consider two main types of novelty detection problems. The first, to which we refer as “small-sample”, fixes  $n+m=100$  and considers different values of  $m$ . The second instead fixes  $n=|\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}|=120$  and considers a  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  which either outnumbers  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  ( $m=200$ ) or is in turn outnumbered ( $m=30$ ). The small-sample experiments are designed to mimic a scenario where  $m$  and  $n$  are very small, with differing ratios of  $m$  to  $n$ . The fixed  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  size experiments consider a more moderate setting with larger but fixed  $n$  and  $m$  either greater than or less than  $n$ . In general, conformal methods are designed with the setting  $n > m$  in mind, so we believe a setting which violates this presumption is of interest as well.

**Outlier detection and novelty detection models.** A running motif of this work is that training over the entirety of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  as well as  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  should affect which ML models are used to score the units. Under the SC paradigm, where we partition  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  into  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}$ , we use the former split as a trainset for a novelty detection model which then differentiates between  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$ . The one-class SVM is one such novelty detection algorithm that have seen use in experiments of previous works (Bates et al., 2023; Lee and Ren, 2024).

In the FC paradigm, we willingly contaminate the trainset with potentially true outliers. As long as the resulting scores can still differentiate between outliers and inliers, FC methods should be powerful—however, this no longer follows the traditional novelty detection framework, which requires an uncontaminated trainset. We instead use unsupervised outlier detection models, such as the Isolation Forest (Liu et al., 2012), to score our units.

Lastly, we use the Python package `scikit-learn` (Pedregosa et al., 2011) for all implementations.




Figure 3: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND, SC-based methods, and AdaDetect with multiple choices of hold-out proportion in the small-sample experiment series. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 1,000 replications.

### 5.1.1 Experiment results for $K = 1$

Figure 3 shows the empirical power achieved in the small-sample experiments. We consider three different splits of the total data ( $m \in \{10, 30, 50\}$ ), four different choices of true outlier proportion in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  ( $\pi_1 \in \{0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$ ), and vary the signal strength  $a$ . The underlying data is generating using  $d_W = n_W = 30$ . Figure 4 shows the empirical power achieved in moderate  $n = 120$  settings, for both  $m = 30 < n$  and  $m = 200 > 120$ . Again, the signal strength and  $\pi_1$  are varied.

In both figures, we compare 1-FC ND (specified as the e-BH version) to AdaDetect as well as SC ND (also using e-BH) at FDR level  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Since SC ND relies on novelty detection models, we use the one-class SVM as the model for the scores. For 1-FC ND, we instead use the Isolation Forest (with 50 trees per forest). For AdaDetect, we use empirical risk minimization (ERM) in conjunction with a binary Random Forest classifier, as specified in Marandon et al. (2024). For AdaDetect and SC ND, we vary the fraction of hold-out data  $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ . 1-FC ND outperforms any method which requires splitting  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$ , especially at lower values of  $a$  and for sparser outliers. The FDR is also controlled at  $\alpha = 0.1$ ; see Figures 12 and 13 in Appendix C for the FDP plots.

### 5.1.2 Experiment results for $K = 5$

We also investigate the power performance of  $K$ -FC ND compared to methods involving splitting  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$ . For brevity, we choose  $K = 5$  and the setting of  $m = 30, n = 120$  (with  $d_W = n_W = 30$  as before). We vary  $\pi_1 \in \{0.1, 0.2\}$  and select FDR level  $\alpha = 0.1$ . We see that over the range of signal strengths, 5-FC ND (the e-BH-CC version) achieves power comparable to naively using BH on 5-FC p-values (beating splitting methods along the way; see Figures 16 and 19 in Appendix C) as well as improving upon the base e-BH version of 5-FC. The FDR is controlled at  $\alpha$ , as expected. Figure 5 demonstrates the effect of conditional calibration for 5-FC ND.




Figure 4: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND, SC-based methods, and AdaDetect with multiple choices of hold-out proportion for the  $n = 120$  experiment series. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 500 replications.

### 5.1.3 Experiment results for $K = 1$ with null proportion correction

Lastly, for the  $m = 200, n = 120$  setting, we implement the null proportion correction for 1-FC e-BH detailed in Section 3.4. The specific stopping time  $\tau_j$  is chosen as

$$\tau_j^{(10)} := \sup \left\{ k \in [n + m] : \left| \{ l \in \{k, k + 1, \dots, n + m\} : \hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(S(l)) \geq \hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(S(l + 1)) \} \right| = 10 \right\}.$$

Intuitively, as we travel backward from  $k = n + m, \dots, 1$ , we stop the tenth time that the event  $\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(S(k)) \geq \hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}(S(k + 1))$  occurs. Figure 6 shows the performance of the corrected and uncorrected procedure at FDR level  $\alpha = 0.1$ . The correction improves the power, especially for weaker signals, as well as tightens the FDR control from  $\pi_0\alpha$  to  $\alpha$ , as desired.

## 5.2 Simulations in the distribution shift setting

**Updated setting.** In addition to the cluster-esque data generation, we must also incorporate distribution shift between  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ . Similar to the setup in Jin and Candès (2023a); Lee and Ren (2024), we can first generate the test inliers (and outliers) as in the previous subsection; this inlier distribution is denoted as  $Q$ . Then, we generate the inliers in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  from  $P$ , where  $dQ/dP(z) \equiv w(z) \propto \sigma(z^\top \theta)$ . Here,  $\sigma$  denotes the sigmoid function and  $\theta \in \mathcal{R}^{d_w}$  such that  $\theta_j = (4 - j)/10 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{j \leq 3\}$ . Hence, the reference units are subsampled from the original distribution via a linear model composed of the first three components.

### 5.2.1 Experiment results for $K = 1$ (under distribution shift)

Figure 7 shows the empirical power achieved in the small-sample experiments. We consider two different splits of the total data ( $m \in \{10, 30\}$ ), vary  $\pi_1 \in \{0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$ , and vary the signal strength  $a$ . Again,  $d_W = n_W = 30$ . Figure 8 shows the empirical power achieved in moderate  $n = 120$  settings, for both  $m = 30 < n$  and  $m = 200 > n$ . Again, the signal strength and  $\pi_1$  are varied.

As expected, conditionally calibrated 1-FC ND achieves higher power than their SC analogues (also conditionally calibrated; see Lee and Ren (2024)) for all choices of training fraction  $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ ,




Figure 5: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 5-FC e-BH, e-BH-CC, and BH for  $n = 120, m = 30$ . The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 200 replications. Note 5-FC BH does not provably control the FDR.




Figure 6: Comparison of power for 1-FC e-BH with and without incorporating null proportion correction ( $m = 200, n = 120$ ). The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 500 replications.

while maintaining FDR control at  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Lastly, Figure 9 shows the effect of the e-BH-CC framework: the proposed method (black) closes the gap between 1-FC e-BH (orange) and 1-FC BH (blue).

### 5.3 A real-data application: fraud detection with limited reference data

In addition to simulations, we apply our method to a real-world dataset which serves as a benchmark for outlier detection algorithms: the “Credit Card” dataset, which contains transaction data for both fraudulent and non-fraudulent credit card activity (Kaggle Dataset, nd). The fraudulent transactions are labeled as outliers (count: 492), while the non-fraudulent transactions are labeled as inliers (count: 284,315). Each row in the dataset contains the “class” entry, which identifies the point as an inlier and outlier, as well as 30 covariates, all of which are anonymized except for two (the time and monetary amount of transaction).

Since our methodology is designed for settings where splitting the reference dataset of known inliers can adversely affect the quality of the trained nonconformity score as well as the granularity of the resulting conformal p-values (or e-values), we start from the entire dataset and sample small subsets to act as our reference and test dataset. Formally, for  $n = 50, m = 100$ , and  $\pi_1 \in \{0.05, 0.1\}$ , we construct a reference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  by sampling  $n$  known inliers from the dataset (without replacement). Then, we construct a test dataset of size  $m$  by randomly sampling  $\pi_1 m$  known outliers and  $(1 - \pi_1)m$  known inliers (without replacement, such that these inliers are also sampled without replacement with respect to the initial construction of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$ ) and combining these outliers and inliers. The resulting  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  thus exhibits a true nonnull proportion of  $\pi_1$ . We then shuffle the contents of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ .

This induces a scenario where we are lacking in reference datapoints, each of which are of moderately high dimension. Hence, density estimation methods will generally fail (Marandon et al., 2024), so we choose to conformalize random forests and their variants, specifically the Isolation Forest, which were preferentially used in our simulations in the previous subsections. Even these non-parametric classifiers, however, will suffer when the size of the training dataset is on the order of the dimension of the dataset. In this setting, the value of each single reference point for both training and producing reference scores translate to the relatively strong performance of our FC ND procedure.






Figure 7: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND (1-FC e-BH-CC) and SC e-BH-CC with multiple choices of hold-out proportion in the small-sample experiment series with distribution shift. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 1,000 replications.




Figure 8: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND (1-FC e-BH-CC) and SC e-BH-CC with multiple choices of hold-out proportion in the  $n = 120$  experiment series with distribution shift. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 500 replications.

For FDR target levels  $\alpha \in \{0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$ , we compare the performances of three main families of procedures:

- 1-FC ND: this is our proposed methodology, choosing  $K = 1$  (see Section 3). We train an Isolation Forest (Liu et al., 2012) with 50 trees per forest.
- SC- $\rho$  ND: this is the split conformal method proposed in Bates et al. (2023) (more specifically, its equivalent e-BH version; see Section 6 of Lee and Ren (2024)). We also train an Isolation Forest (50 trees per forest) and use a  $\rho$  fraction of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  for training, with  $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ .
- AD- $\rho$  ND: this is the AdaDetect method proposed in Marandon et al. (2024). In order to use their ERM-based scoring, we use a binary Random Forest classifier. We use  $\rho$  fraction of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  to set aside as a pure inlier sample for training, with  $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ .

We again use the Python library `scikit-learn` for implementations. For the methods which holdout  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$ , we choose the holdout set at random. For each choice of hyperparameters, we run 500 replications, returning the mean FDP and power (with standard error reported in parentheses).

Figures 10 and 11 plot the resulting empirical FDP and power of the described experiments with  $\pi_1 = 0.05$  and  $\pi_1 = 0.1$ , respectively. In each experiment, we see that 1-FC ND outperforms the AdaDetect and SC methods for each choice of  $\rho$ . In addition, the empirical mean FDP of 1-FC ND is controlled at the respective FDR target level  $\alpha$ , which is to be expected. The power improvement of 1-FC ND over SC-based methods or AdaDetect is especially noticeable when the true outliers are highly sparse in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  (i.e.,  $\pi_1 = 0.05$ ). It is worth noting that 1-FC ND also achieves the highest average FDP while still demonstrating FDR control. This can be interpreted as the method having a more efficient usage of the FDR budget compared to its competitors. The full tables of results can be found in Appendix D.




Figure 9: e-BH-CC boosting the power of 1-FC ND in the distribution shift setting with  $n = 120$ . The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 500 replications. Note 1-FC BH does not provably control the FDR.




Figure 10: Empirical power and FDP results from simulated experiments using the Credit Card dataset, with  $m = 100, n = 50, \pi_1 = 0.05$ . The results are averaged over 500 replications.

## 6 Discussion

In this paper, we introduce a methodology for model-free novelty detection based on the full-conformal inference framework. In contrast to previous works that use conformal p-values, we construct conformal e-values to quantify evidence for novelty, thereby addressing the technical difficulty of establishing finite-sample FDR control. This approach also allows us to develop methodology which is non-random, unlike previous methods which take random splits of the reference dataset for training and testing. We instantiate the e-BH-CC framework, which significantly improves the detection power of our approach, and extend the methods to the setting of distribution shift.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Wharton Research Computing team for the amazing support provided by the staff members. J.L. is partially supported by a Graduate Research Fellowship from the NSF. Z.R. is supported by NSF grant DMS-2413135.




Figure 11: Empirical power and FDP results from simulated experiments using the Credit Card dataset, with  $m = 100, n = 50, \pi_1 = 0.1$ . The results are averaged over 500 replications.

## References

- Abad, J., Bhatt, U., Weller, A., and Cherubin, G. (2022). Approximating full conformal prediction at scale via influence functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01315*.
- Ahmed, M., Mahmood, A. N., and Islam, M. R. (2016). A survey of anomaly detection techniques in financial domain. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 55:278–288.
- Angelopoulos, A. N., Barber, R. F., and Bates, S. (2024). Theoretical foundations of conformal prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11824*.
- Bai, T. and Jin, Y. (2024). Optimized conformal selection: Powerful selective inference after conformity score optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.17983*.
- Barber, R. F., Candès, E. J., Ramdas, A., and Tibshirani, R. J. (2021). Predictive inference with the jackknife+.
- Bashari, M., Epstein, A., Romano, Y., and Sesia, M. (2024). Derandomized novelty detection with fdr control via conformal e-values. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Bates, S., Candès, E., Lei, L., Romano, Y., and Sesia, M. (2023). Testing for outliers with conformal p-values. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(1):149–178.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). 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.
- Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1165–1188.
- Breunig, M. M., Kriegel, H.-P., Ng, R. T., and Sander, J. (2000). Lof: identifying density-based local outliers. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pages 93–104.
- Carlini, N., Paleka, D., Dvijotham, K. D., Steinke, T., Hayase, J., Cooper, A. F., Lee, K., Jagielski, M., Nasr, M., Conmy, A., et al. (2024). Stealing part of a production language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06634*.
- Ceroli, A. (2010). Multivariate outlier detection with high-breakdown estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(489):147–156.
- Gao, Z. (2023). Adaptive storey’s null proportion estimator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06357*.
- Gao, Z. and Zhao, Q. (2023). Simultaneous hypothesis testing using internal negative controls with an application to proteomics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.01552*.
- Grünwald, P., de Heide, R., and Koolen, W. M. (2024). Safe testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B (Methodology), with discussion*.
- Hawkins, D. (1980). Identification of outliers.
- Hu, X. and Lei, J. (2023). A two-sample conditional distribution test using conformal prediction and weighted rank sum. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–19.
- Ignatiadis, N., Wang, R., and Ramdas, A. (2024). Compound e-values and empirical bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19812*.
- Jin, Y. and Candès, E. J. (2023a). Model-free selective inference under covariate shift via weighted conformal p-values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09291*.
- Jin, Y. and Candès, E. J. (2023b). Selection by prediction with conformal p-values. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(244):1–41.
- Kaggle Dataset (n.d.). Credit card fraud detection data set. Available at <https://www.kaggle.com/mlg-ulb/creditcardfraud>. Dataset created by ULB Machine Learning Group. Accessed: 2024.

- Kim, B., Xu, C., and Barber, R. (2020). Predictive inference is free with the jackknife+-after-bootstrap. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4138–4149.
- Lee, J. and Ren, Z. (2024). Boosting e-bh via conditional calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17562*.
- Lei, J., Rinaldo, A., and Wasserman, L. (2015). A conformal prediction approach to explore functional data. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 74:29–43.
- Liang, Z., Sesia, M., and Sun, W. (2022). Integrative conformal p-values for powerful out-of-distribution testing with labeled outliers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11111*.
- Liu, F. T., Ting, K. M., and Zhou, Z.-H. (2012). Isolation-based anomaly detection. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 6(1):1–39.
- Magnani, C. G., Sesia, M., and Solari, A. (2024). Collective outlier detection and enumeration with conformalized closed testing. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 230:1–1.
- Maini, P., Jia, H., Papernot, N., and Dziedzic, A. (2024). Llm dataset inference: Did you train on my dataset? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06443*.
- Maini, P., Yaghini, M., and Papernot, N. (2021). Dataset inference: Ownership resolution in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.10706*.
- Marandon, A., Lei, L., Mary, D., and Roquain, E. (2024). Adaptive novelty detection with false discovery rate guarantee. *The Annals of Statistics*, 52(1):157–183.
- Mary, D., Bacon, R., Conseil, S., Piqueras, L., and Schutz, A. (2020). Origin: Blind detection of faint emission line galaxies in muse datacubes. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 635:A194.
- Mary, D. and Roquain, E. (2022). Semi-supervised multiple testing. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 16(2):4926–4981.
- Oliynyk, D., Mayer, R., and Rauber, A. (2023). I know what you trained last summer: A survey on stealing machine learning models and defences. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(14s):1–41.
- OpenAI (2023). Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Papadopoulos, H., Proedrou, K., Vovk, V., and Gammerman, A. (2002). Inductive confidence machines for regression. In *Machine learning: ECML 2002: 13th European conference on machine learning Helsinki, Finland, August 19–23, 2002 proceedings 13*, pages 345–356. Springer.
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., Cournapeau, D., Brucher, M., Perrot, M., and Duchesnay, E. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830.
- Ramdas, A. and Wang, R. (2024). Hypothesis testing with e-values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23614*.
- Ren, Z. and Barber, R. F. (2024). Derandomised knockoffs: leveraging e-values for false discovery rate control. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 86(1):122–154.
- Riani, M., Atkinson, A. C., and Cerioli, A. (2009). Finding an unknown number of multivariate outliers. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 71(2):447–466.
- Shafer, G. (2021). 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.
- Shafer, G. and Vovk, V. (2008). A tutorial on conformal prediction. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(3).
- Shuster, S. A., Li, J., Chon, U., Sinantha-Hu, M. C., Luginbuhl, D. J., Udeshi, N. D., Carey, D. K., Takeo, Y. H., Xie, Q., Xu, C., et al. (2022). In situ cell-type-specific cell-surface proteomic profiling in mice. *Neuron*, 110(23):3882–3896.
- Storey, J. D. (2002). A direct approach to false discovery rates. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 64(3):479–498.

- Tibshirani, R. J., Foygel Barber, R., Candès, E., and Ramdas, A. (2019). Conformal prediction under covariate shift. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Tramèr, F., Zhang, F., Juels, A., Reiter, M. K., and Ristenpart, T. (2016). Stealing machine learning models via prediction {APIs}. In *25th USENIX security symposium (USENIX Security 16)*, pages 601–618.
- Vatanen, T., Kuusela, M., Malmi, E., Raiko, T., Aaltonen, T., and Nagai, Y. (2012). Semi-supervised detection of collective anomalies with an application in high energy particle physics. In *The 2012 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. (2005). *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, volume 29. Springer.
- Vovk, V. and Wang, R. (2021). E-values: Calibration, combination and applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1736–1754.
- Wang, R. and Ramdas, A. (2022). False discovery rate control with e-values. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(3):822–852.
- Wasserman, L., Ramdas, A., and Balakrishnan, S. (2020). Universal inference. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(29):16880–16890.
- Weinstein, A., Barber, R., and Candès, E. (2017). A power and prediction analysis for knockoffs with lasso statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06465*.
- Wilks, S. S. (1963). Multivariate statistical outliers. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 407–426.
- Yang, C.-Y., Lei, L., Ho, N., and Fithian, W. (2021). Bonus: Multiple multivariate testing with a data-adaptivetest statistic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15743*.
- Zhao, Z. and Sun, W. (2024). False discovery rate control for structured multiple testing: Asymmetric rules and conformal q-values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, (just-accepted):1–24.

## A Technical proofs

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Fix any  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ . We define a hypothesis-specific stopping time  $T_j$  as follows, which we shall show is equivalent to  $T_j$  when  $V_{n+j} \geq T$ .

$$T_j := \inf \left\{ t \in \{V_i\}_{i=1}^{n+m} : \frac{m}{n+1} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq t\} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq t\}}{1 + \sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+k} \geq t\}} \leq \alpha \right\}.$$

By construction,  $T_j$  is invariant to the permutation of  $V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+j}$ , and  $T_j \leq T$ . On the event  $\{V_{n+j} \geq T\}$ , we have

$$\frac{m}{n+1} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T\} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T\}}{1 + \sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+k} \geq T\}} = \frac{m}{n+1} \cdot \frac{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T\}}{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T\} + \sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+k} \geq T\}} \leq \alpha,$$

with the last step following from the definition of  $T$ . The above also implies that  $T \leq T_j$ . Consequently, we have  $T = T_j$  on the event  $\{V_{n+j} \geq T\}$ . With this fact, we proceed to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e_j] &= (n+1) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T\}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T\}} \right] \\ &\leq (n+1) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T_j\}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T_j\}} \right] \\ &= (n+1) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T_j\}}{(\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T_j\} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T_j\}) \vee 1} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

By assumption,  $V_1, \dots, V_n, V_{n+j}$  are exchangeable given  $\{V_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}}$ . As a result,

$$(n+1) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T_j\}}{(\mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j} \geq T_j\} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T_j\}) \vee 1} \right] = \sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{V_i \geq T_j\}}{(\sum_{k \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbf{1}\{V_k \geq T_j\}) \vee 1} \right] \leq 1,$$

completing the proof.

### A.2 Proof of Proposition 2

Fix any  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ . If  $\phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) \leq 0$ , then by the definition of  $\phi_j$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[e_j^b | S_j] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{m \mathbf{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|} \text{ or } p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_j)\}}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|} \mid S_j \right] = \phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) + \mathbb{E}[e_j | S_j] \leq \mathbb{E}[e_j | S_j].$$

Taking expectation over  $S_j$  on both sides leads to  $\mathbb{E}[e_j^b] \leq \mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq 1$ .

If, on the other hand,  $\phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) > 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e_j^b | S_j] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m \mathbf{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|} \text{ or } p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_{j,\ell})\}}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|} \mid S_j \right] \\ &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{m \mathbf{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|} \text{ or } p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_{j,\ell})\}}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|} \mid S_j \right] \\ &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \phi_j(\hat{c}_{j,\ell}) + \mathbb{E}[e_j | S_j] \leq \mathbb{E}[e_j | S_j], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is by the monotone convergence theorem. Again taking expectation over  $S_j$ , we have in this case that  $\mathbb{E}[e_j^b] \leq \mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq 1$ .

To see that  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1^b, \dots, e_m^b)$ , we leverage the fact shown in [Lee and Ren \(2024\)](#) that  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{e-BH}}(\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_m)$ , where

$$\tilde{e}_j = \frac{m \mathbf{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|}\}}{\alpha |\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|}, \quad \forall j \in [m].$$

Since  $\tilde{e}_j \leq e_j^b$  deterministically, we complete the proof.

### A.3 Proof of Proposition 3

Fix  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$  and let  $B_k$  denote the block to which  $Z_{n+j}$  belongs. By construction, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e_j}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] = (n+1) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}}{1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq T_k\}} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right].$$

Define an alternative stopping time:

$$\hat{T}_k = \inf\left\{t \in \mathcal{V}^{(k)} : \frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq t\} + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq t\}}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_{n+\ell}^{(k)} \geq t\}} \leq \tilde{\alpha}\right\}.$$

Per their definitions, it is straightforward to see that  $\hat{T}_k \leq T_k$ . On the event  $\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}$ ,

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\} + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq T_k\}}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_{n+\ell}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}} = \frac{1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} V_i^{(k)} \geq T_k}{\sum_{\ell \in [m]} \mathbb{1}\{V_{n+\ell}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}} \leq \tilde{\alpha},$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of  $T_k$ . Again by the definition of  $\hat{T}_k$ ,  $\hat{T}_k \leq T_k$ . Putting everything together, we have  $T_k = \hat{T}_k$  on the event  $\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e_j}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] &\leq (n+1) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}}{1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] \\ &= (n+1) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}}{1 \vee \sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\hat{T}_j$  and  $\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}$  are both invariant to the permutations on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \{Z_{n+j}\}$ , and that  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j}$  are exchangeable given  $\{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j}$  (since  $j \in \mathcal{H}_0$ ). So for any  $i \in [n]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}}{1 \vee \sum_{\ell \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_\ell^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}}{1 \vee \sum_{\ell \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_\ell^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}}{1 \vee \sum_{\ell \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_\ell^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}}{1 \vee \sum_{\ell \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_\ell^{(k)} \geq \hat{T}_k\}} \cdot \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above, we arrive at  $\mathbb{E}[e_j/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[1/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}]$ . We proceed to bound the right-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}}\right] &= \frac{m}{n+1} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}\right] \\ &= \frac{m}{n+1} \sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{m}{n+1} \sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}{1 + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}}{1 \vee (\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\})}\right]. \quad (16)$$



Recall that  $\tau_j$  is a stopping time with respect to the backwards filtration  $\{\mathcal{G}_k\}_{k \in [n+m]}$ . Therefore, we can find some function  $f$  such that for any  $k \in [n+m]$ , there is

$$\mathbb{1}\{\tau_j \geq k\} = f(\{A_\ell\}_{\ell \geq k}, \{B_\ell\}_{\ell \geq k}),$$

where  $A_\ell = 1 + \sum_{\ell' \neq j} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell'} \leq S_\ell\}$  and  $B_\ell = \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+j} \leq S_\ell\} + \sum_{\ell' \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{S_{\ell'} \leq S_\ell\}$ .

To proceed, we also define an alternative stopping time  $\tilde{\tau}_{j,i}$  via

$$\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{\tau}_{j,i} \geq k\} = f(\{\tilde{A}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq k}, \{\tilde{B}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq k}), \quad \forall k \in [n+m]$$

where  $\tilde{A}_\ell = \mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_\ell\} + \sum_{\ell' \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell'} \leq S_\ell\}$  and  $\tilde{B}_\ell = 1 + \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+j} \leq S_\ell\} + \sum_{\ell' \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{\ell'} \leq S_\ell\}$ .

We shall show that  $\tau_j = \tilde{\tau}_{j,i}$  on the event  $\{S_i \leq S_{(\tau_j)}\}$ . To see this, first note that for any  $k \geq \tau_j$ ,  $S_i \leq S_{(k)}$  and therefore  $A_k = \tilde{A}_k$ ,  $B_k = \tilde{B}_k$ . We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{\tau}_{j,i} \geq \tau_j + 1\} &= f(\{\tilde{A}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j+1}, \{\tilde{B}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j+1}) = f(\{A_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j+1}, \{B_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j+1}) = \mathbb{1}\{\tau_j \geq \tau_j + 1\} = 0 \\ \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{\tau}_{j,i} \geq \tau_j\} &= f(\{\tilde{A}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j}, \{\tilde{B}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j}) = f(\{A_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j}, \{B_\ell\}_{\ell \geq \tau_j}) = \mathbb{1}\{\tau_j \geq \tau_j\} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\tau = \tilde{\tau}_{j,i}$ .

Returning to (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (16) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tilde{\tau}_{j,i})}\}}{1 \vee (\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tilde{\tau}_{j,i})}\} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq S_{(\tilde{\tau}_{j,i})}\})} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_0|} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_\ell\} + \sum_{\ell' \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell'} \leq S_{(\tilde{\tau}_{j,i})}\}}{1 \vee (\mathbb{1}\{S_i \leq S_{(\tilde{\tau}_{j,i})}\} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{S_{n+\ell} \leq S_{(\tilde{\tau}_{j,i})}\})} \right] \\ &\leq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality is due to the exchangeability of  $\{S_i\} \cup \{S_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}}$  and that  $\tilde{\tau}_{(j,i)}$  is invariant to the permutation of  $\{Z_i\} \cup \{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in \mathcal{H}_0 \setminus \{j\}}$ . As a result,  $\mathbb{E}[1/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}] \leq m$ , completing the proof.

**Remark 2.** Recall that the FDR target  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is a component of the  $e$ -value construction, as the threshold  $T_j$  is determined using  $\tilde{\alpha}$ . Denoting this dependence as  $e_j(\tilde{\alpha})$  (and  $T_j(\tilde{\alpha})$ ), the above proof implicitly assumes  $e_j(\alpha)$  to be constructed with a constant  $\tilde{\alpha}$ . However, the Storey-BH procedure actually runs BH at the FDR target  $\tilde{\alpha}/\hat{\pi}_0$ , where  $\hat{\pi}_0$  is the Storey estimator for the true null proportion  $\pi_0$ . Intuitively, one should also construct the  $e$ -values at this less stringent FDR target in order to improve the power of each  $e$ -value marginally. The question is, then, whether the proof of Proposition 3 implies  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{H}_0} \mathbb{E}[e_j(\tilde{\alpha}/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)})/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}] \leq m$ , where now the dependence is on a data-driven modification to the FDR target.

The answer turns out to be in the affirmative—Proposition 3 continues to hold for  $e_j(\alpha/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)})$ . This is as the first part of the proof, which culminates in the result  $\mathbb{E}[e_j/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[1/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}]$ , essentially requires that  $\hat{T}_j$  and  $\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}$  are invariant to permutations of  $S_1, \dots, S_n, S_{n+j}$ . The latter has been shown to be invariant as so. Thus, the data-dependent FDR target  $\tilde{\alpha}/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}$  is also invariant, and one can follow through the construction of  $T_j(\cdot)$  to quickly verify  $T_j(\tilde{\alpha}/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)})$  thus stays invariant as well. Hence,  $\mathbb{E}[e_j/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[1/\hat{\pi}_0^{(j)}]$ , and the rest of the proof is independent to the original level chosen to construct the  $e$ -values.

## A.4 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* We first fix  $j$  and the block  $k$  that  $Z_{n+j}$  belongs to. Define the modified threshold

$$\hat{T}_k = \inf \left\{ t \in \mathcal{V}^{(k)} : \frac{m}{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)} \cdot \frac{w(Z_{n+j})\mathbb{1}\{V_j^{(k)} \geq t\} + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)\mathbb{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq t\}}{1 + \sum_{k \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{1}\{V_{n+k}^{(k)} \geq t\}} \leq \tilde{\alpha} \right\}.$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we can use the fact that on the event  $\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}$ , we have  $T_k = \widehat{T}_k$ . Now, under  $H_j$ , write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[e_j] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}}{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq T_k\}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}}{w(Z_{n+j}) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\} + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq T_k\}} \right] \quad (\text{using the notation of } 0/0 = 0) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\}}{w(Z_{n+j}) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\} + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\}}{w(Z_{n+j}) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\} + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\}} \middle| \mathcal{E}_j, \{Z_{n+k}\}_{k \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \right] \right] \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i)}{w(Z_{n+j}) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\} + \sum_{i=1}^n w(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\} \middle| \mathcal{E}_j, \{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \in [m] \setminus \{j\}} \right] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_j = [\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+j}\}]$ , the unordered elements of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup \{Z_{n+j}\}$ .

Step (a) is allowed due to considering the expectation on and off the event  $\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq T_k\}$ , similar to the analogous step in Appendix A.1, equation (15). Regarding step (b): the tower property allows us to take out the first multiplicative term in the last line, as both the numerator and denominator are constructable using  $\mathcal{E}_j$  without knowing the indices of the unordered members. This is true in turn because  $\widehat{T}_k$  is also constructable using the conditioning items, again using the fact that  $\widehat{T}_k$  is a function of  $\mathcal{E}_j$  and is invariant to the true order of the unordered items.

Hence, we must evaluate

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\} \middle| \mathcal{E}_j, \{Z_{n+k}\}_{k \neq j} \right] = \mathbb{P}(V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k \mid \mathcal{E}_j, \{Z_{n+k}\}_{k \neq j})$$

We know this conditional distribution: assuming no ties in the resulting scores in  $\mathcal{V}^{(k)}$ , we have that

$$V_{n+j}^{(k)} \mid \{\mathcal{E}_j = z\}, \{Z_{n+\ell}\}_{\ell \neq j} \sim \sum_{\ell \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \frac{w(z_\ell)}{w(z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(z_i)} \delta_{v_\ell}$$

because 1) the elements in  $\mathcal{E}_j$  are assumed to be weighted exchangeable and 2) the scoring function  $V^{(k)}(\cdot)$  was trained invariant to the order of elements inside  $\mathcal{E}_j$  (this assumes that  $V^{(k)}$  does not use external randomness during training; similar results can be attained for random training procedures by conditioning on the random seed). Thus, we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq t \mid \mathcal{E}_j) = \sum_{\ell \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \frac{w(Z_\ell) \mathbf{1}\{V_\ell^{(k)} \geq t\}}{w(z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(z_i)}$$

which directly implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k \mid \mathcal{E}_j, \{Z_{n+k}\}_{k \neq j}) = \frac{w(z_{n+j}) \mathbf{1}\{V_{n+j}^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\} + \sum_{i=1}^n w(z_i) \mathbf{1}\{V_i^{(k)} \geq \widehat{T}_k\}}{w(z_{n+j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(z_i)}$$

as  $\widehat{T}_k$  is a constant w.r.t. the conditioning items and  $\{Z_{n+k}\}_{k \neq j} \perp \mathcal{E}_j$ . Hence, substituting this back into our computation above, we conclude that  $\mathbb{E}[e_j] \leq 1$  under  $H_j$ .  $\square$

## B Additional results on e-BH-CC

### B.1 Sampling distributions

Fix  $j \in [m]$  and let  $k$  denote the block to which  $Z_{n+j}$  belongs. For notational simplicity, define

$$G_j(c) := \frac{m \mathbb{1}\{e_j \geq \frac{m}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|} \text{ or } p_j \leq A(c)\}}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|}$$

and note that  $\phi_j(c; S_j) = \mathbb{E}[G_j(c) | S_j]$ . Since  $G_j(c)$  is a function of the  $K$ -FC e-values and p-values, it is fully determined given

$$\mathcal{V}_j := \begin{bmatrix} [\{V_i^{(1)}\}_{i \in [n]}] \cup \{V_{n+\ell}^{(1)}\}_{\ell \in [m]} \\ \vdots \\ [\{V_i^{(K)}\}_{i \in [n]}] \cup \{V_{n+\ell}^{(K)}\}_{\ell \in [m]} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Next, we use  $V(\cdot; \mathcal{D})$  to denote the scoring function, emphasizing that it is trained over  $\mathcal{D}$ . Under  $H_j$ , there is

$$\mathcal{V}_j | S_j \sim \sum_{i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}} \frac{1}{n+1} \cdot \delta_{\mathcal{V}_j^{(i)}},$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}_j^{(i)} = \begin{bmatrix} [\{V(Z_\ell; S_j \setminus \{Z_i\} \cup B_1)\}_{\ell \neq i}] \cup \{V(Z_{n+\ell}; S_j \setminus \{Z_i\} \cup B_1)\}_{\ell \neq j} \\ \vdots \\ [\{V(Z_\ell; S_j \cup B_k)\}_{\ell \neq i}] \cup \{V(Z_{n+\ell}; S_j \cup B_k)\}_{\ell \neq j} \\ \vdots \\ [\{V(Z_\ell; S_j \setminus \{Z_i\} \cup B_K)\}_{\ell \neq i}] \cup \{V(Z_{n+\ell}; S_j \setminus \{Z_i\} \cup B_k)\}_{\ell \neq j} \end{bmatrix}.$$

### B.2 The equivalent form of $e_j^b$

**Lemma 1.** For any  $j \in [m]$ , let  $q_j = \min\{c \geq 1 : p_j \leq A(c)\}$ . Then there is

$$e_j^b = \frac{m \mathbb{1}\{\phi_j(q_j; S_j) \leq 0\}}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|}, \quad \forall j \in [m].$$

*Proof.* Fix  $j \in [m]$ . We first consider the case where  $\phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) \leq 0$  and  $\phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) > 0$  respectively.

- **Case 1:**  $\phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) \leq 0$ . If  $\phi_j(q_j; S_j) \leq 0$ , then  $q_j \leq \hat{c}_j$  by definition. Then by the choice of  $p_j$  and the monotonicity of  $A(\cdot)$ ,  $p_j \leq A(q_j) \leq A(\hat{c}_j)$ . Conversely, if  $p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_j)$ , then by definition of  $q_j$ ,  $\hat{c}_j \geq q_j$ , and therefore  $0 \geq \phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) \geq \phi_j(q_j; S_j)$ . Collectively, there is  $\mathbb{1}\{\phi_j(q_j; S_j) \leq 0\} = \mathbb{1}\{p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_j)\}$ .
- **Case 2:**  $\phi_j(\hat{c}_j; S_j) > 0$ . If  $\phi_j(q_j; S_j) \leq 0$ , then  $q_j < \hat{c}_j$ . Since  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \hat{c}_{j,\ell} = \hat{c}_j$ , there exists  $\ell_0$ , such that  $\hat{c}_{j,\ell_0} \geq q_j$ . We then have  $p_j \leq A(q_j) \leq A(\hat{c}_{j,\ell_0})$ , and therefore  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_{j,\ell})\} = 1$ . If instead  $\phi(q_j; S_j) > 0$ , then  $q_j \geq \hat{c}_j$ . For any  $\ell \geq 1$ ,  $\hat{c}_{j,\ell} < q_j$ , and therefore  $p_j > A(\hat{c}_{j,\ell})$ . Consequently,  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{p_j \leq A(\hat{c}_{j,\ell})\} = 0$ . In this case, we also conclude that  $\mathbb{1}\{\phi(q_j; S_j) \leq 0\} = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{1}\{p_j \leq \phi_j(\hat{c}_{j,\ell}; S_j)\}$ .

Putting everything together, we conclude that  $e_j^b = \frac{m \mathbb{1}\{\phi_j(q_j; S_j) \leq 0\}}{\alpha|\mathcal{R} \cup \{j\}|}$ .  $\square$

## C Further numerical experiments

### C.1 Deferred details on conditional calibration

For the experiments detailed in Section 5, the details on using e-BH-CC were deferred for brevity. We expand upon the choices made in the numerical experiments here.




Figure 12: Comparison of FDP as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND (1-FC e-BH), SC-based methods, and AdaDetect with multiple choices of hold-out proportion in the small-sample experiment series. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ , highlighted by the dashed red line. Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 1,000 replications.

Firstly, for all uses of e-BH-CC, the data-dependent threshold  $A(c)$  is chosen as the BH threshold, i.e.,  $c \cdot \alpha |\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{BH}}(p_1, \dots, p_m) \cup \{j\}|/m$ . We include  $j$  in the rejection set regardless so that the set will never be empty, and we find that this does not noticeably affect the e-BH-CC procedure.

For the unweighted case, e-BH-CC was only implemented for the  $K = 5$  experiment. Here, the denominator is chosen as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_j = \mathbf{1}\{j \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}}\} \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}} + \mathbf{1}\{j \notin \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}}, j \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{BH}}\} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{1}\{p_k \leq p_j\} + \mathbf{1}\{j \notin \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}}, j \notin \mathcal{R}^{\text{BH}}\} (\mathcal{R}^{\text{BH}} \cup \{j\}).$$

The reasoning is that if we would like e-BH to recover at least part of the BH set, then we should at least consider rejecting the smaller p-values at a more stringent threshold, rather than rejecting all the p-values at the same threshold. In addition, note that in (10), the subtracted  $e_j$  term (also referred to as the “CC budget”) can be replaced with any e-value without sacrificing the validity of the boosted e-values. Hence, we replace  $e_j$  with 1 for these experiments.

For the weighted case, e-BH-CC was used for all FC ND methods. The denominator in (10) is actually chosen to be  $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{\text{BH}}(p_1, \dots, p_m) \cup \{j\}$ , rather than the e-BH rejection set. Note that the validity of e-BH-CC still holds.

## C.2 FDP plots

Figure 12 and Figure 14 show the FDP of relevant algorithms for the small-sample experiments in the default and distribution shift setting, respectively. Figure 13 and Figure 15 show the FDP of relevant algorithms for the  $n = 120$  experiment series in the default and distribution shift setting, respectively.

## C.3 Comparison of 5-FC ND to other procedures

Figure 16 demonstrates the performance of 5-FC e-BH-CC against the random SC and AdaDetect base-lines. Our non-random procedure still achieves higher power than SC and AdaDetect over all training proportions  $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ .




Figure 13: Comparison of FDP as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND, SC-based methods, and AdaDetect with multiple choices of hold-out proportion for the  $n = 120$  experiment series. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ , highlighted by the dashed red line. Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 500 replications.

#### C.4 Comparison of $K$ -FC ND to non-random procedures

Although the experiments in Section 5 were primarily to argue the relative power improvement achieved by using the FC paradigm, one may argue that the comparison is not apples-to-apples as SC- $\rho$  methods are random, while FC methods are not. Hence, we briefly report the results of comparing 1-FC methods to derandomized versions of the SC methods which follow the framework of Bashari et al. (2024). Briefly, we can derandomize the SC e-values by averaging the e-value produced by different splits of the data. That is, we choose  $D$  different (random) splits of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}$  into a train and calibration set:  $\{(\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{(d)}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}^{(d)})\}_{d \in [D]}$ . For each  $d$ , the nonconformity scoring function  $V^{(d)}$  is trained on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{(d)}$  and outputs the scores of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}^{(d)}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}^{(d)}$ . The e-values  $\{e_j^{(d)}\}_{j \in [m]}$  are then produced via following (5) and (6). At the end, the averaged e-values  $\{\bar{e}_j\}_{j \in [m]}$ , where

$$\bar{e}_j := \frac{1}{D} \sum_{d=1}^D e_j^{(d)}$$

are used as input to the e-BH procedure to get an FDR-controlling rejection set.

Figure 17 and 18 show the power comparison between 1-FC ND (where the distribution shift setting uses e-BH-CC) and the derandomized SC- $\rho$  methods ( $\rho \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ ) with  $D = 20$ . As derandomization generally hurts the power of the e-BH rejection set (see, e.g., Ren and Barber (2024); Lee and Ren (2024)), the fact that 1-FC ND improves upon the derandomized SC methods is to be expected—in Section 5, we see that their random versions are still beat. The FDP is controlled provably by all methods, so we do not present these results here. Note that although conditional calibration can be used to boost derandomized SC methods in the weighted case, as per Lee and Ren (2024), it would take an intractable amount of computation as the scoring function would have to be retrained for every resampling of the train-calibration split. This serves as another justification for using 1-FC ND methods in the presence of distribution shift, as the conditional calibration component is quite light, computationally speaking.

Lastly, Figure 19 shows the performance of 5-FC e-BH-CC for  $n = 120, m = 30$  (non-distribution shift setting) relative to derandomized SC procedures. As expected, splitting methods achieve lower power when  $K = 5$  and e-BH-CC is used.




Figure 14: Comparison of FDP as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND (1-FC e-BH-CC) and SC e-BH-CC with multiple choices of hold-out proportion in the small-sample experiment series with distribution shift. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ , highlighted by the dashed red line. Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 1,000 replications.




Figure 15: Comparison of FDP as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND (1-FC e-BH-CC) and SC e-BH-CC with multiple choices of hold-out proportion in the  $n = 120$  experiment series with distribution shift. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ , highlighted by the dashed red line. Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 500 replications.




Figure 16: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 5-FC ND and SC methods and AdaDetect for  $n = 120, m = 30$ . The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 200 replications.




Figure 17: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND and derandomized SC-based methods in the small-sample experiment series. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 1,000 replications.




Figure 18: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 1-FC ND and derandomized SC-based methods in the small-sample experiment series with distribution shift. The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 1,000 replications.




Figure 19: Comparison of power as a function of signal strength between 5-FC ND and derandomized SC-based methods for  $n = 120, m = 30$ . The FDR target is  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Error bars are shaded and show a margin of two standard errors. Each experiment consists of 200 replications.

## D Results from the real-data analysis

The following Tables 2 and 3 show the FDP and power of the real-data analysis on the Credit Card dataset, covered in Section 5.3.

Table 2: Empirical power and FDP results from simulated experiments using the Credit Card dataset, with  $m = 100, n = 50, \pi_1 = 0.05$ . The results are averaged over 500 replications; standard errors are shown in parentheses. For each experiment, the highest power achieved is highlighted in bold.

| FDR target Procedure | $\alpha = 0.2$ |                      | $\alpha = 0.3$ |                      | $\alpha = 0.4$ |                      | $\alpha = 0.5$ |                      |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
|                      | FDP            | Power                | FDP            | Power                | FDP            | Power                | FDP            | Power                |
| 1-FC e-BH            | 0.068 (0.009)  | <b>0.095</b> (0.013) | 0.154 (0.012)  | <b>0.234</b> (0.017) | 0.291 (0.014)  | <b>0.444</b> (0.019) | 0.398 (0.015)  | <b>0.586</b> (0.019) |
| AD-0.25              | 0.012 (0.005)  | 0.001 (0.001)        | 0.040 (0.009)  | 0.001 (0.001)        | 0.106 (0.014)  | 0.005 (0.001)        | 0.223 (0.019)  | 0.010 (0.002)        |
| AD-0.5               | 0.008 (0.004)  | 0.001 (0.001)        | 0.057 (0.010)  | 0.003 (0.001)        | 0.117 (0.014)  | 0.006 (0.002)        | 0.212 (0.018)  | 0.019 (0.003)        |
| AD-0.75              | 0.000 (0.000)  | 0.000 (0.000)        | 0.031 (0.008)  | 0.008 (0.003)        | 0.086 (0.012)  | 0.026 (0.005)        | 0.182 (0.017)  | 0.056 (0.008)        |
| SC-0.25 e-BH         | 0.034 (0.007)  | 0.040 (0.008)        | 0.133 (0.012)  | 0.166 (0.015)        | 0.236 (0.015)  | 0.290 (0.018)        | 0.316 (0.016)  | 0.389 (0.020)        |
| SC-0.5 e-BH          | 0.021 (0.006)  | 0.024 (0.007)        | 0.088 (0.011)  | 0.108 (0.013)        | 0.201 (0.015)  | 0.247 (0.018)        | 0.335 (0.017)  | 0.413 (0.020)        |
| SC-0.75 e-BH         | 0.012 (0.005)  | 0.014 (0.005)        | 0.045 (0.009)  | 0.052 (0.010)        | 0.157 (0.015)  | 0.174 (0.016)        | 0.244 (0.017)  | 0.278 (0.019)        |

Table 3: Empirical power and FDP results from simulated experiments using the Credit Card dataset, with  $m = 100, n = 50, \pi_1 = 0.1$ . The results are averaged over 500 replications; standard errors are shown in parentheses. For each experiment, the highest power achieved is highlighted in bold.

| FDR target Procedure | $\alpha = 0.2$ |                      | $\alpha = 0.3$ |                      | $\alpha = 0.4$ |                      | $\alpha = 0.5$ |                      |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
|                      | FDP            | Power                | FDP            | Power                | FDP            | Power                | FDP            | Power                |
| 1-FC e-BH            | 0.087 (0.008)  | <b>0.181</b> (0.015) | 0.189 (0.010)  | <b>0.418</b> (0.018) | 0.300 (0.011)  | <b>0.578</b> (0.015) | 0.404 (0.011)  | <b>0.707</b> (0.014) |
| AD-0.25              | 0.008 (0.004)  | 0.001 (0.000)        | 0.062 (0.010)  | 0.005 (0.002)        | 0.111 (0.014)  | 0.008 (0.002)        | 0.210 (0.018)  | 0.019 (0.003)        |
| AD-0.5               | 0.005 (0.003)  | 0.003 (0.002)        | 0.047 (0.009)  | 0.016 (0.004)        | 0.098 (0.012)  | 0.025 (0.004)        | 0.227 (0.018)  | 0.053 (0.006)        |
| AD-0.75              | 0.003 (0.002)  | 0.003 (0.002)        | 0.062 (0.010)  | 0.045 (0.007)        | 0.120 (0.013)  | 0.068 (0.008)        | 0.217 (0.017)  | 0.138 (0.012)        |
| SC-0.25 e-BH         | 0.062 (0.007)  | 0.107 (0.013)        | 0.167 (0.011)  | 0.309 (0.018)        | 0.255 (0.012)  | 0.441 (0.018)        | 0.362 (0.013)  | 0.562 (0.017)        |
| SC-0.5 e-BH          | 0.028 (0.006)  | 0.044 (0.009)        | 0.146 (0.011)  | 0.262 (0.018)        | 0.257 (0.012)  | 0.445 (0.019)        | 0.359 (0.013)  | 0.599 (0.018)        |
| SC-0.75 e-BH         | 0.018 (0.005)  | 0.022 (0.006)        | 0.069 (0.009)  | 0.095 (0.013)        | 0.189 (0.014)  | 0.260 (0.018)        | 0.278 (0.015)  | 0.386 (0.020)        |



## E Algorithms

---

**Algorithm 2:**  $K$ -block full conformal ND procedure

---

**Input:** reference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ ; test dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{n+m}\}$ ;  
nonconformity score model-to-train  $f$ ; number of blocks  $K$ ; target FDR level  $\alpha$ .

- 1 Partition  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  into  $K$  blocks  $B_1, \dots, B_K$ .
- 2 **for**  $k \in [K]$  **do**
- 3     Train  $V^{(k)}(\cdot) \leftarrow f(\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k)$ .
- 4     **for**  $i \in [n+m]$  **do**
- 5          $V_i^{(k)} \leftarrow V^{(k)}(Z_i)$ .
- 6     Compute threshold  $T^{(k)}$  using  $\{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  as in (7).
- 7     **for**  $j: Z_{n+j} \in B_k$  **do**
- 8          $T_j \leftarrow T^{(k)}$ .
- 9         Compute  $e_j$  using  $\{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  and  $T_j$  as in (7).
- 10  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1, \dots, e_m)$ , the e-BH procedure at level  $\alpha$ .

**Output:** Rejection set  $\mathcal{R}$

---

---

**Algorithm 3:**  $K$ -block conformal ND procedure with conditional calibration
 

---

**Input:** reference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ ; test dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{n+m}\}$ ;  
 nonconformity score model-to-train  $f$ ; number of blocks  $K > 1$ ; target FDR level  $\alpha$ .

- 1 Partition  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  into  $K$  blocks  $B_1, \dots, B_K$ .
- 2 **for**  $k \in [K]$  **do**
- 3     Train  $V^{(k)}(\cdot) \leftarrow f(\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k)$ .
- 4     **for**  $i \in [n+m]$  **do**
- 5          $V_i^{(k)} \leftarrow V^{(k)}(Z_i)$ .
- 6     Compute threshold  $T^{(k)}$  using  $\{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  as in (7).
- 7     **for**  $j: Z_{n+j} \in B_k$  **do**
- 8          $T_j \leftarrow T^{(k)}$ .
- 9         Compute  $e_j$  using  $\{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  and  $T_j$  as in (7).
- 10 **for**  $j \in [m]$  **do**
- 11      $\hat{\phi}_j \leftarrow 0$ .
- 12     **for**  $i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}$  **do**
- 13         Resample new datasets  $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{ref}}^{(i)}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{test}}^{(i)} = \bigcup_{k \in [K]} \widetilde{B}_k$  by swapping  $Z_{n+j}$  and  $Z_i$ .
- 14         **for**  $k \in [K]$  **do**
- 15             Train  $\widetilde{V}^{(k)} \leftarrow f(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{ref}}^{(i)} \cup \widetilde{B}_k)$ .
- 16         Construct resampled scores  $\{\widetilde{V}^{(k)}\}_{k \in [K]}$ , e-values  $\tilde{e}_j^{(i)}$  and p-values  $\tilde{p}_j^{(i)}$ .
- 17          $\hat{\phi}_j \leftarrow \hat{\phi}_j + \frac{1}{n+1} \cdot \tilde{A}^{(i)}$ , where  $\tilde{A}^{(i)}$  is the term inside the expectation of (10) at  $c = q_j$   
        evaluated using the resampled  $\tilde{e}_j^{(i)}$  and  $\tilde{p}_j^{(i)}$ .
- //  $\hat{\phi}_j$  is exactly equal to  $\phi_j(q_j; S_j)$
- 18     Boost  $e_j$  to  $e_j^b$  with conditional calibration, using  $\hat{\phi}_j$  as per (12).
- 19  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1^b, \dots, e_m^b)$ , the e-BH procedure at level  $\alpha$ .

**Output:** Rejection set  $\mathcal{R}$

---

---

**Algorithm 4:** Weighted  $K$ -block conformal ND procedure with conditional calibration
 

---

**Input:** reference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ ; test dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{Z_{n+1}, \dots, Z_{n+m}\}$ ; weight function  $w(\cdot)$ ; nonconformity score model-to-train  $f$ ; number of blocks  $K > 1$ ; target FDR level  $\alpha$ .

- 1 Partition  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$  into  $K$  blocks  $B_1, \dots, B_K$ .
  - 2 **for**  $k \in [K]$  **do**
  - 3     Train  $V^{(k)}(\cdot) \leftarrow f(\mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}} \cup B_k)$ .
  - 4     **for**  $i \in [n+m]$  **do**
  - 5          $V_i^{(k)} \leftarrow V^{(k)}(Z_i)$ .
  - 6     Compute threshold  $T^{(k)}$  using  $\{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  as in (14).
  - 7     **for**  $j: Z_{n+j} \in B_k$  **do**
  - 8          $T_j \leftarrow T^{(k)}$ .
  - 9         Compute  $e_j$  using  $\{V_i^{(k)}\}_{i \in [n+m]}$  and  $T_j$  as in (14).
  - 10  $W \leftarrow w(Z_{n+j}) + \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{ref}}^{(i)}} w(Z)$
  - 11 **for**  $j \in [m]$  **do**
  - 12      $\hat{\phi}_j \leftarrow 0$ .
  - 13     **for**  $i \in [n] \cup \{n+j\}$  **do**
  - 14         Resample new datasets  $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{ref}}^{(i)}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{test}}^{(i)} = \bigcup_{k \in [K]} \tilde{B}_k$  by swapping  $Z_{n+j}$  and  $Z_i$ .
  - 15         **for**  $k \in [K]$  **do**
  - 16             Train  $\tilde{V}^{(k)} \leftarrow f(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{ref}}^{(i)} \cup \tilde{B}_k)$ .
  - 17         Construct resampled scores  $\{\tilde{V}^{(k)}\}_{k \in [K]}$ , e-values  $\tilde{e}_j^{(i)}$  and p-values  $\tilde{p}_j^{(i)}$ .
  - 18          $\hat{\phi}_j \leftarrow \hat{\phi}_j + \frac{w(Z_i)}{W} \cdot \tilde{A}^{(i)}$ , where  $\tilde{A}^{(i)}$  is the term inside the expectation of (10) at  $c = q_j$  evaluated using the resampled  $\tilde{e}_j^{(i)}$  and  $\tilde{p}_j^{(i)}$ .
  - 19         //  $\hat{\phi}_j$  is exactly equal to  $\phi_j(q_j; S_j)$
  - 19     Boost  $e_j$  to  $e_j^{\text{b}}$  with conditional calibration, using  $\hat{\phi}_j$  as per (12).
  - 20  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}^{\text{e-BH}}(e_1^{\text{b}}, \dots, e_m^{\text{b}})$ , the e-BH procedure at level  $\alpha$ .
- Output:** Rejection set  $\mathcal{R}$
-