# Statistically Significant k-Nearest Neighbors Anomaly Detection by Selective Inference

Mizuki Niihori<sup>1</sup>, Teruyuki Katsuoka<sup>1</sup>, Tomohiro Shiraishi<sup>1</sup>, Shuichi Nishino<sup>12</sup>, Ichiro Takeuchi<sup>12†</sup>

February 19, 2025

#### Abstract

This paper explores unsupervised anomaly detection (AD) using the k-Nearest Neighbor (NN) method. The k-Nearest Neighbor Anomaly Detection (kNNAD) is a simple yet effective method for detecting anomalies in various fields. A key challenge in AD is appropriately quantifying the reliability of detected anomalies. To address this, we formulate kNNAD as a statistical hypothesis test and quantify the false detection rate using p-values. The main challenge is conducting both detecting and testing AD on the same data, which hinders correct p-value calculation. We address this by introducing *Selective Inference (SI)* and proposing *Statistically Significant kNNAD (Stat-kNNAD)*. The Stat-kNNAD method ensures that detected anomalies are statistically significant with theoretical guarantees. We demonstrate the validity of the Stat-kNNAD through experiments on synthetic, benchmark, and industrial datasets.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Nagoya University

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ RIKEN

 $<sup>^{\</sup>dagger}$ Corresponding author. e-mail: takeuchi.ichiro.n6@f.mail.nagoya-u.ac.jp

## 1 Introduction

In this study, we consider semi-supervised anomaly detection (AD) using the knearest neighbor (NN) approach [Breunig et al., 2000, Ramaswamy et al., 2000, Mehrotra et al., 2017]. Semi-supervised AD detects anomalies using only normal training instances. In many practical cases, such as industrial AD, anomalous instances are rare, making semi-supervised AD essential. We focus on the knearest neighbor anomaly detection (kNNAD) among various semi-supervised AD methods. The kNNAD approach is simple yet effective, offering flexibility, minimal data assumptions, and adaptability to different distance metrics.

An important challenge in semi-supervised AD is quantifying the reliability of detected anomalies [Barnett, 1994, Chandola et al., 2009, Montgomery, 2020]. Without anomalous training instances in training, estimating detection accuracy is challenging. Furthermore, modeling anomaly distributions is difficult since similar anomalies may not occur repeatedly. To address this issue, we formulate semi-supervised kNNAD as a statistical test to quantify false AD probability using p-values. If the p-values are accurately calculated and, anomalies with p-values below a desired significance level (e.g., 5%) can be detected, ensuring that the detected anomalies are statistically significantly different from normal instances in the specified significance level.

However, a critical challenge emerges when formulating semi-supervised AD as a statistical test. The primary issue is conducting both detection and testing of anomalies on the same data, which makes accurate p-value calculation intractable. In traditional statistics, selecting and evaluating a hypothesis on the same data causes selection bias in p-values, leading to inaccuracies—a problem known as *double dipping* [Breiman, 1992, Kriegeskorte et al., 2009, Benjamini, 2020]. In semi-supervised AD, since only normal instances are available, both the detection and evaluation must rely on the same data. Thus, a naive statistical test formulation cannot avoid the double dipping issue.

To address this issue, we employ *Selective Inference (SI)*, a statistical framework gaining attention in the past decade [Fithian et al., 2014, Taylor and Tibshirani, 2015, Lee et al., 2016]. SI ensures valid statistical inferences after data-driven selection of hypotheses by correcting selection biases, ensuring accurate p-values and confidence intervals. SI was originally designed to assess feature selection reliability, enabling accurate significance evaluation even when selection and evaluation use the same dataset [Lee et al., 2016, Tibshirani et al., 2016, Duy and Takeuchi, 2022]. The key principle of SI is to perform statistical inference conditioned on the selected hypothesis. By using conditional probability distributions, SI effectively mitigates selection bias from double dipping. In this study, we propose *Statistically Significant kNNAD (Stat-kNNAD)*, a method that performs statistical hypothesis test conditioned on anomalies detected by the *k*NNAD algorithm. The Stat-*k*NNAD offers theoretical guarantees and precise quantification of false anomaly detection probability.

Our contributions are summarized as follows. First, we formulate semisupervised AD using kNNAD as a statistical test within the SI framework, enabling accurate reliability quantification of detected anomalies. While kNNAD is widely used, no existing method theoretically and accurately quantifies the false identification probability of detected anomalies. Second, to enable conditional inference for kNNAD, we decompose it into tractable selection events (linear or quadratic inequalities) within the SI framework, Notably, applying kNNAD in deep learning-based latent spaces requires representing complex deep learning operations in a tractable form, posing a significant technical challenge (details in § 4). Finally, through experiments on various datasets and industrial product AD, we validate the effectiveness of Stat-kNNAD. Specifically, for industrial product images, we show that applying kNNAD in the latent space of a pretrained CNN effectively addresses practical challenges. A more comprehensive discussion on related work, as well as the scope and limitations of this work, is presented in §5.

# 2 Problem Setup

In this section, we present the problem setup<sup>1</sup>. The proposed Stat-kNNAD method consists of two-stages as illustrated in Fig. 1.



Figure 1: Schematic illustration of Stat-kNNAD: In Stage 1, anomalies are screened using kNNAD. In Stage 2, statistical significance is assessed via pvalues, and instances with p-values below a significance level  $\alpha$  (e.g., 5%) are identified as anomalies. We apply kNNAD in both the original feature space and the latent space from pretrained deep learning models.

#### 2.1 Dataset and Its Statistical Model

In semi-supervised AD problems, the available training dataset consists only of the set of normal instances. Let  $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  represent the set of *d*dimensional feature vectors for *n* normal training instances, where *n* is the number of instances. To formulate semi-supervised AD as a statistical hypothesis test, we interpret these feature vectors as realizations of random vectors  $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The true signal vector of  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted as  $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for  $i \in [n]$ , where [n] represents the set of natural numbers up to *n*. We do not assume any prior knowledge or assumptions about true signal vectors  $\{s_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ . Denoting the additive noise for normal training instances as  $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$ In §5, we will discuss the scope, limitations, and potential extensions of the problem setup.

the random vector  $\boldsymbol{X}_i$  is represented as

$$\boldsymbol{X}_i = \boldsymbol{s}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i, \quad i \in [n]. \tag{1}$$

To conduct statistical inference, we assume the noise vectors  $\varepsilon_i$  follow a Gaussian distribution with the mean vector **0** and the covariance matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . It is assumed that the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  is either known or estimable using independent data — a reasonable assumption in semi-supervised AD problems where a sufficiently large number of normal instances are available.

#### 2.2 Statistical Test Formulation

Let the feature vector of a test instance be denoted as  $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{test}}$  and its corresponding random version as  $\boldsymbol{X}^{\text{test}}$ . We assume  $\boldsymbol{X}^{\text{test}} = \boldsymbol{s}^{\text{test}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\text{test}}$  in the same way as Eq.(1), where  $\boldsymbol{s}^{\text{test}}$  is the (unknown) true signal and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\text{test}}$  is the Gauusian noise with covariance  $\Sigma$ . In this paper, we focus on the k-nearest neighbor approach as the choice of anomaly detection algorithm. In kNNAD, the k normal training instances closest to  $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{test}}$  are selected from the n available training instances. We denote the set of the k nearest neighbor instances as  $\mathcal{N} \subset [n]$ . The details of the kNNAD approach for the 1st-stage anomaly screening are described in §3.

The problem of determining whether the test instance  $x^{\text{test}}$  is can be done based on whether the true signals of the selected k normal training instances  $\{s_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$  and that of the test instance  $s^{\text{test}}$  differ significantly. Let the vector obtained by averaging the (unknown) true signal vectors of the selected k normal training instances

$$ar{m{s}}^{k\mathrm{NN}} := rac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} m{s}_i.$$

The kNNAD can be considered as a statistical test with the following null hypothesis  $H_0$  and alternative hypothesis  $H_1$ :

$$\mathbf{H}_0: \boldsymbol{s}^{\text{test}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}^{k\text{NN}} \quad \text{v.s.} \quad \mathbf{H}_1: \boldsymbol{s}^{\text{test}} \neq \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}^{k\text{NN}}.$$
(2)

The null hypothesis  $H_0$  states that the mean true signal of the k nearest normal training instances equals the true signal of the test instance, while the alternative

hypothesis  $H_1$  asserts they are different. By performing a statistical test on these hypotheses, the false detection probability of an anomaly can be quantified using *p*-values.

To solve the statistical test in Eq. (2) and compute the *p*-value, the difference between  $\bar{s}^{k\text{NN}}$  and  $s^{\text{test}}$  must be estimated from the observed data. As a reasonable test statistic for the hypothesis test in Eq. (2), we consider:

$$T(\boldsymbol{X}^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{X}_n) := \left\| \boldsymbol{X}^{\text{test}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{X}}^{k\text{NN}} \right\|_1,$$
(3)

where  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}^{k\text{NN}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{X}_i$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_1$  indicates the  $L_1$  norm. The *p*-value for quantifying the statistical significance of the test instance  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{test}}$  is defined as the probability of observing the test statistic greater than or equal to the observed test-statistic  $T(\mathbf{x}^{\text{test}}, \mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  under the null hypothesis  $H_0$  in Eq. (2). Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  represent the significance level (e.g.,  $\alpha = 0.05$ ). If test instances with *p*-values less than  $\alpha$  are declared as anomalies, the probability of false identification can be controlled to remain below  $\alpha$ . This enables semi-supervised anomaly detection with guaranteed statistical significance. The details of *p*value computation, which is our main contribution, are described in §4.

#### 2.3 The kNNAD in Latent Feature Space

For detecting anomalies in complex data such as images, signals, and text, effective feature extraction before AD is crucial. In particular, using latent features from deep learning models enhances AD Li et al. [2021], Chalapathy and Chawla [2019], Bergman et al. [2020]. This study applies kNNAD in both the original feature space and latent feature spaces from pretrained deep learning models. Hereafter, we consider semi-supervised anomaly detection for images.

With a slight abuse of notation, let us consider a set of n normal images, each with d pixels, denoted as  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ . As discussed earlier, these observed images are realizations of random images  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , where each  $X_i$  is modeled as an (unknown) true pixel value vector  $s_i$  with additive Gaussian noise  $\varepsilon_i$ , as described in Eq. (1). To obtain suitable image features, we assume the availability of a pretrained deep learning model (e.g., those trained on benchmark classification tasks such as ImageNet).

We define the transformation of an image  $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  into a latent feature vector (e.g., the feature representations from the layer preceding the final layer) as  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{DL}} : \mathbb{R}^d \ni \boldsymbol{x}_i \mapsto \boldsymbol{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{d}}$  where  $\boldsymbol{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{d}}$  is the extracted  $\tilde{d}$ -dimensional feature vector. The kNNAD is then performed on the latent vectors  $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{test}} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{DL}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{test}}), \quad \boldsymbol{z}_i = \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{DL}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i), \quad i \in [n].$  For images, where neighboring pixel values often exhibit similarity, we use the following modified test statistic:  $T_{\mathrm{image}}(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{X}_n) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in [d]} X_{\cdot j}^{\mathrm{test}} - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in [d]} \bar{X}_{\cdot j}^{\mathrm{kNN}}.$ 

# 3 Anomaly Screening by k-NN

This section outlines the first anomaly screening stage  $^2$ .

The k-nearest neighbor anomaly detection (kNNAD) In kNNAD, the distance between the test instance  $x^{\text{test}}$  and its k-th nearest normal training instance among n instances  $\{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  is used as a criterion. We denote the k-th nearest normal training instance as  $x_{(k)}$  and the distance between  $x^{\text{test}}$  and  $x_{(k)}$  as dist $(x^{\text{test}}, x_{(k)})$ . Since the choice of k affects the distance magnitude, we adopt the following well-known anomaly score Mehrotra et al. [2017]:

$$a(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{test}}) = \log \operatorname{dist} \left( \boldsymbol{x}^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{x}_{(k)} \right) - \frac{\log k}{d}, \qquad (4)$$

where the first term represents the log-scale distance, and the second term adjusts for the influence of k's selection <sup>3</sup>. In the first anomaly screening stage, if Eq. (4) exceeds a certain threshold  $\theta$ , the test instance  $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{test}}$  is selected as a candidate anomaly. The threshold  $\theta$  is typically set based on the empirical distribution of anomaly scores among normal instances.

Selection of k The choice of k greatly affects the results in kNNAD. Users can set k based on domain knowledge or experience. However, when domain knowledge is limited or data is complex, a systematic approach is needed. In semi-supervised AD, unlike supervised learning such as k-NN classification or regression, it is not possible to determine k through data splitting. A data-driven method to select k calculates the anomaly score for various k values per test instance  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{test}}$ , choosing the k that maximizes this score. In the Stat-kNNAD method, whether k is chosen specifically or determined through this heuristic, the false detection probability is controlled.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ Note that this anomaly screening approach is already well-known and does not contain any novel technical aspects.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The choice of Eq. (4) is based on certain assumptions and heuristics in the literature, but its details are beyond the scope of this paper. For further information, refer to Mehrotra et al. [2017].

# 4 Statistical Test for Anomaly Candidates

In this section, we describe a statistical test for calculating *p*-values for potential anomalies identified in the 1st stage. In the 2nd stage, anomalies are identified by selecting only candidates with *p*-values smaller than the significance level  $\alpha$ (e.g., 0.05), allowing for appropriate control of the false detection probability.

#### 4.1 Main Selection Events

The core idea of SI is to conduct statistical inference based on conditional distribution of the test-statistic conditional on the hypothesis selection event. In our problem, it is necessary to consider two selection events to account for the following two facts:

- **SE1** The test statistic in Eq.(3) depends on the selection of k-nearest neighbors.
- **SE2** The anomaly candidates are selected because the anomaly score in Eq.4 is grater than the threshold  $\theta$ .

Before discussing these two selection events, we introduce some additional notations. Let us denote the (1 + n)d-dimensional vector obtained by concatenating the test instance  $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{test}}$  and n training instance  $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n$ , all of which are d-dimensional vectors, as

$$oldsymbol{y} = ext{vec}\left(oldsymbol{x}^{ ext{test}},oldsymbol{x}_1,\ldots,oldsymbol{x}_n
ight) \in \mathbb{R}^{(1+n)d},$$

where vec is the operation that concatenates multiple vectors into a single column vector. Similarly, the (1+n)d-dimensional vector obtained by concatenating 1 + n d-dimensional random vectors is denoted as

$$oldsymbol{Y} = ext{vec}\left(oldsymbol{X}^{ ext{test}},oldsymbol{X}_1,\ldots,oldsymbol{X}_n
ight) \in \mathbb{R}^{(1+n)d}$$

With these notations, we rewrite the test statistic in Eq.(3) as  $T(\mathbf{Y}) = \|\mathbf{X}^{\text{test}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}^{k\text{NN}}\|_1$ .

**SE1:** Selection event for k neighbors Let the index of the kth nearest neighbor in the observed data be denoted as (k). The event that specific k

training instances are selected as the k-nearest neighbors of the test example is expressed as

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{X}^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_{(\bar{k})}) \le \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{X}^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_{(\underline{k})})$$
(5)

for all  $(\bar{k}, \underline{k}) \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \times \{k + 1, \ldots, n\}$ . With a slight abuse of notations, we denote the set of indices for the k nearest neighbors of the test instance  $\mathbf{X}^{\text{test}}$  and n training instances  $\mathbf{X}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{X}_n$  sampled from the statistical model in §2.1 as  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}}$  (in §2, we only denote this as  $\mathcal{N}$ ). Hereafter, the conditions in Eq.(5) is represented as  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}$ .

SE2: Selection event for anomaly screening Since the statistical test in the 2nd stage is performed only on test instances selected in the 1st-stage anomaly screening, it is essential to consider the selection events associated with it. A test instance is selected in the 1st-stage if its anomaly score, as defined in Eq. (4), exceeds a threshold  $\theta$ . Because the anomaly score in Eq. (4) is calculated based on the k-the nearest neighbor instance, the condition on the k-the nearest neighbor instance must also be incorporated. Specifically, by conditioning on

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{X}^{\operatorname{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_{(k)}) \ge \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{X}^{\operatorname{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_{(k')})$$
(6)

for k' = 1, ..., k - 1, and

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{X}^{\operatorname{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_{(k)}) \leq \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{X}^{\operatorname{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_{(k')})$$

for k' = k+1, ..., n, we can consider only cases where the k-the nearest neighbor is the same as the observed case. Furthermore, the condition for the anomaly score is written as

$$\log \operatorname{dist} \left( \boldsymbol{X}^{\text{test}}, \boldsymbol{X}_{(k)} \right) - \frac{\log k}{d} \ge \theta.$$
(7)

With the conditions in Eqs.(6)-(7), we can characterize the selection event that the test case  $\mathbf{X}^{\text{test}}$  is selected as an anomaly candidate in the 1st-stage anomaly screening. Hereafter, these conditions are collectively represented as  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{y}}$ . **SI with main selection events** The SI taking into account the above two types of selection events is performed based on the sampling distribution of the following conditional test-statistic:

$$T(\mathbf{Y}) \mid \{\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{y}}\}.$$
(8)

Performing statistical inference based on the conditional test-statistic in Eq.(8) means that we consider only cases where the randomness of the data  $\boldsymbol{Y}$  satisfies  $\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ , which enables us to circumvent the selection bias associated with the above two selection events.

#### 4.2 Additional Selection Events

To make the computation of SI tractable, it is common in the SI literature to introduce additional selection events besides the main selection events mentioned above. In our problem, it is necessary to introduce the following two additional selection events:

- **SE3** A selection event to make the computation of the  $L_1$  norm in the test statistic tractable.
- **SE4** A selection event related to the sufficient statistic for the nuisance component.

We note that introducing these additional selection events does not affect the control of the false detection probability, but tends to reduce the power (true detection probability) of the test.

**SE3:** Selection event for  $L_1$  norm. SI can be applied when the test statistic  $T(\mathbf{Y})$  can be expressed as a linear function of the data  $\mathbf{Y}$ . In our problem, the test statistic  $T(\mathbf{Y})$  can be expressed as a linear function of  $\mathbf{Y}$  by introducing additional conditions. Specifically, to remove the absolute value operator in the definition of  $L_1$  norm, we fix the sign of each dimension by condition, which can be written as

$$\operatorname{sgn}(X_{\cdot j}^{\operatorname{test}} - \bar{X}_{\cdot j}^{k\operatorname{NN}}) = \operatorname{sgn}(x_{\cdot j}^{\operatorname{test}} - \bar{x}_{\cdot j}^{k\operatorname{NN}})$$
(9)

for all  $j \in [d]$ . Together with the condition  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}$ , the test statistic  $T(\mathbf{Y})$ can be expressed as a linear function of  $\mathbf{Y}$  as

$$T(\boldsymbol{Y}) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} \boldsymbol{Y}$$

using a certain vector  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^{(1+n)d}$ . Hereafter, the condition in Eq.(9) is represented as  $S_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = S_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ .

SE4: Selection event for nuisance component. Finally, to make SI tractable, it is necessary to condition on the sufficient statistic of the nuisance component of the test statistic  $T(\mathbf{Y}) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} \mathbf{Y}$ . Specifically, the nuisance parameter of the test statistic is expressed as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}} := \left( I_{(1+n)d} - \frac{\tilde{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} \tilde{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \mathbf{Y},$$

where  $\tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{(1+n)d \times (1+n)d}$  is a block-diagonal matrix with  $\Sigma$  in each  $d \times d$  diagonal block. The conditioning on the nuisance component  $\mathcal{Q}_{Y}$  is a standard practice of SI literature to make the computation tractable <sup>4</sup> Hereafter, we denote this selection event as  $\mathcal{Q}_{Y} = \mathcal{Q}_{y}$ .

#### 4.3 Selective *p*-values

By conditioning on  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}, \ \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{y}}, \ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}}, \ \text{and} \ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}, \ \text{we can}$ derive the exact sampling distribution of the test statistic  $T(\mathbf{Y})$  under null distribution  $H_0$ , which enables us to compute the valid *p*-value.

**Definition 1** (Selective *p*-values). The selective *p*-value for a test instance  $x^{\text{test}}$  is defined as

$$p_{\text{selective}} := \mathbb{P}_{H_0} \begin{pmatrix} T(\mathbf{Y}) \ge T(\mathbf{y}) & \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}, \\ \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{y}}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}}, \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(10)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>For example,  $Q_Y$  corresponds to z defined in §5, Eq.(5.2) in the seminal SI paper Lee et al. [2016].

The selective p-values in Eq.(10) correctly quantifies the false detection probability as formally stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** The selective p-values defined in Eq.(10) satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_{0}}\left(p_{\text{selective}} \leq \alpha \begin{vmatrix} \mathcal{N}_{Y} = \mathcal{N}_{y}, \\ \mathcal{K}_{Y} = \mathcal{K}_{y}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{Y} = \mathcal{S}_{y}, \\ \mathcal{Q}_{Y} = \mathcal{Q}_{y} \end{vmatrix} = \alpha, \ \forall \alpha \in (0, 1).$$
(11)

Furthermore, the property in Eq.(11) indicates the selective p-values are valid in the (unconditional) marginal sampling distribution, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{H}_{0}}(p_{\mathrm{selective}} \leq \alpha) = \alpha, \ \forall \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix A.

#### 4.4 Selection Event for Data-driven selection of k

In the case of the data-driven option for determining the number of neighbors k, its effect must also be appropriately considered as a selection event. For example, consider the scenario where  $k_1, \ldots, k_K$  are candidate values for k, and the candidate that maximizes the anomaly score in Eq. (4) is selected. Let the selected  $k \in \{k_1, \ldots, k_K\}$  be denoted as  $k^*$ . Then, the selection event is simply given by  $\log \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}^{\operatorname{test}}, \boldsymbol{x}_{(k^*)}) - \frac{\log k^*}{d} \ge \log \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}^{\operatorname{test}}, \boldsymbol{x}_{(k_t)}) - \frac{\log k_t}{d}, \forall t \in [K]$ . In the case of data-driven option to determine k, in addition to the four selection events mentioned above, this event must also be incorporated as an additional condition.

#### 4.5 Selection Event for Deep Learning Models

When using kNNAD with feature representations from a pre-trained deep learning model, the influence of the model should be considered as a selection event. SI for deep learning has been discussed in prior studies, and tools like the software developed by Katsuoka et al. [2025] facilitate the analysis of selection events in these models. In this study, we employ methods from earlier research to calculate selective p-values, taking into account selection events related to deep learning models. The basic idea in these methods involves decomposing the model into components and representing each as a piecewise linear function. For example, operations in a CNN such as convolution, ReLU activation, max pooling, and up-sampling are represented as piecewise linear functions. In the experiment, we utilize the feature representation of a CNN model pre-trained on the ImageNet database. This model is represented precisely as a composition of piecewise linear functions, facilitating accurate computation of selective p-values through parametric programming. Details on the selection events concerning the deep learning model are discussed further in Appendix B.

#### 4.6 Computing Selective *p*-values

Calculating selective *p*-values is complex, but we effectively use methods from existing SI research. We specifically use the parametric programming (pp)-based method from previous studies [Sugiyama et al., 2021, Le Duy and Takeuchi, 2021, Duy and Takeuchi, 2022]. In SI, statistical inference is based on the probability measure within the subspace  $\mathcal{Z}$  of the data space  $\mathbb{R}^{(1+n)d}$  where selection event conditions are met. By conditioning on the selection event for the nuisance component,  $\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}$  reduces to a one-dimensional subspace. The selection events are formulated as unions of intersections of linear or quadratic inequalities, suitable when using  $L_1$  or  $L_2$  distances for k-nearest neighbors.  $\mathcal{Z}$ consists of finite number of intervals along a line in the (1 + n)d-dimensional space, and the pp-based method systematically enumerates all intervals that meet these conditions.

Since the noise is Gaussian, the test statistic  $T(\mathbf{Y})$  under the null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> follows a one-dimensional truncated Gaussian distribution within the subspace  $\mathcal{Z}$ , comprising finite intervals along a line. The selective *p*-value is calculated as the tail probability of this truncated distribution. Early SI research often simplified calculations by assuming  $\mathcal{Z}$  as a single interval under additional conditions, which still controls the false detection probability but reduces detection power. In our problem, a similar simplification can be considered by enforcing  $\mathcal{Z}$  to be a single interval. In the experiments in §6, we conduct an ablation study comparing this simple approach (denoted as w/o-pp) as one of the baselines.

## 5 Related Work, Scope, and Limitations

AD can be broadly categorized into three problem settings: supervised, semisupervised, and unsupervised Mehrotra et al. [2017], Ramaswamy et al. [2000], Breunig et al. [2000]. The focus of this study, semi-supervised AD, assumes that only normal instances are available in the training data, which is frequently encountered in real-world applications. Without anomalous instances, datasplitting techniques such as cross-validation cannot easily quantify anomaly detection confidence.

Traditional approaches to handling semi-supervised AD within the framework of statistical test assumes some parametric distribution for the signals of normal instances ( $\{s_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  in our notation) <sup>5</sup>. Various parametric approaches exist — see Barnett [1994]. AD for industrial products has been studied in the field of statistical quality control. These approaches also impose several assumptions on the signals of normal data and quantify deviations from these assumptions for detecting anomalies — see Montgomery [2020]. In the machine learning community, methods such as One-class SVM [Schölkopf et al., 2001] and Isolation Forest [Liu et al., 2008], and deep learning-based techniques [Chalapathy and Chawla, 2019, Bergman et al., 2020, Li et al., 2021], have been proposed for AD. However, no existing studies provide theoretical guarantees for the statistical reliability of detected anomalies by these methods.

Assessing the statistical reliability of semi-supervised AD is challenging because the same data is used for both detection and evaluation (the doubledipping problem). Recently, SI has emerged as an effective solution, addressing hypothesis evaluation using the same data and being applied to various problems [Lee et al., 2015, Yang et al., 2016, Suzumura et al., 2017, Hyun et al., 2018, Rügamer and Greven, 2020, Tanizaki et al., 2020, Das et al., 2021, Rügamer et al., 2022, Gao et al., 2022, Le Duy et al., 2024]. Relevant SI studies include statistical testing for outliers in linear models Chen and Bien [2019], Tsukurim-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Note that, in this study, we do not impose any assumptions on the signals themselves but instead assume a distribution for the noise added to the signals.

ichi et al. [2022], change points in time series Duy et al. [2020], Hyun et al. [2021], Jewell et al. [2022], Shiraishi et al. [2024b], and salient regions in deep learning model Duy et al. [2022], Daiki et al., Shiraishi et al. [2024a], Miwa et al. [2024], Katsuoka et al. [2024]. We follow this research direction, aiming to provide finite-sample reliability guarantees for a widely used kNNAD.

The problem setting in this study is flexible for real-world use, as it imposes no signal assumptions and allows pre-trained model features. However, limitations remain. First, the approach assumes additive normal noise, suitable for industrial anomaly detection but restrictive in fields like social or life sciences, where noise is unknown and impactful. Additionally, to keep selective p-value computation tractable, restrictions exist on the test statistic and distance metric for defining k-NNs. Current SI methods require a linear test statistic and cannot yet handle nonlinear cases. For distance metrics,  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  allow exact selective p-values, while more complex metrics require approximations. These limitations may be addressed as SI research advances.

## 6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we demonstrate that the proposed method exhibits high power (true positive rate) while controlling the type I error rate (false positive rate) below the significance level compared to other methods. First, experiments are conducted on synthetic datasets, followed by similar experiments on two types of real datasets. All experiments are conducted with a significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

#### 6.1 Methods Comparison

In the experiments on synthetic datasets and tabular datasets, we compare the proposed method (Stat-kNNAD) with three other methods: w/o-pp, naive, and bonferroni. Subsequently, in the experiments on image datasets, we additionally compare two further methods: opA1 and opA2.

- w/o-pp: An ablation study that excludes the parametric programming technique described in §4.6.
- naive: This method uses a classical z-test without conditioning, i.e., we compute the naive p-value as  $p_{\text{naive}} = \mathbb{P}_{H_0}(|T(\boldsymbol{Y})| \ge |T(\boldsymbol{y})|).$
- bonferroni: This is a method to control the type I error rate by using the Bonferroni correction. There are <sup>n</sup><sub>k</sub> ways to choose the neighbors N, then we compute the Bonferroni corrected p-value as p<sub>bonferroni</sub> = min(1, <sup>n</sup><sub>k</sub>) ⋅ p<sub>naive</sub>).
- OpA1: Another ablation study that excludes the selection events for kNNAD (i.e., N<sub>Y</sub>, K<sub>Y</sub>, and S<sub>Y</sub>).
- OpA2: Another ablation study that excludes the selection events for DNN (i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  in Appendix B).

#### 6.2 Synthetic Datasets

To evaluate the type I error rate, we changed the training dataset size  $n \in \{100, 200, 500, 1000\}$  and set the data dimension d = 2. The number of neighbors

k was either fixed at 1 or adaptively selected in a data-driven manner from  $\{1, 2, 5, 10\}$ . See Appendix C.1 for results when d and k are changed. For each configuration, we iterated 1,000 experiments. In each iteration, we generated test instance  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{test}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$  and train instances  $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$  for  $i \in [n]$ . To evaluate the power, we changed the signal strength  $\delta \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$  and set d = 2, n = 100. We also evaluate two settings of k, identical to those used above. See Appendix C.2 for results when d, k, and n are changed. For each configuration, we iterated 1,000 experiments. In each iteration, we generated test instance  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{test}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathbf{I}_d)$  and train instances  $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$  for  $i \in [n]$ .

The results of type I error rate are shown in Figure 2. The Stat-kNNAD, w/o-pp, and bonferroni successfully controlled the type I error rate under the significance level, whereas the naive could not. Because the naive failed to control the type I error rate, we no longer consider its power. The results of power are shown in right side of Figure 3. Among the methods that controlled the type I error rate, the Stat-kNNAD has the highest power.



Figure 2: Results of type I error rate when changing the dataset size *n*. Our proposed method (Stat-kNNAD), the ablation study (w/o-pp), and the Bonferroni method (bonferroni) successfully control the type I error rate across all settings. The results of the bonferroni are almost zero, because it is too conservative. However, the naive method (naive) fails.



Figure 3: Power when changing signal strength  $\delta$ . Our proposed method (Stat-kNNAD) outperformed other methods in all settings.

#### 6.3 Real Datasets I: Tabular Data

We conducted evaluations using 10 tabular real-world datasets. These datasets reflect various real-world problems from different domains. The datasets used in our experiments are listed in Appendix C.3. Only numerical features from each dataset were used in the experiments. The datasets vary in dimensionality, ranging from 4 to 10 dimensions. For the number of neighbors k, we conducted experiments under two conditions: a fixed setting where k = 1, and an adaptive selection setting where k was chosen from  $\{1, 2, 5, 10\}$  based on the data. Before conducting the experiments, All datasets are standarized with each feature having mean 0 and variance 1. The results of the type I error rate and power are shown in Figure 4. The Stat-kNNAD method outperformed the other methods in terms of power, while controlling the type I error rate below the significance level.

### 6.4 Real Datasets II: Image Data

In this experiment, we used the MVTec AD dataset Bergmann et al. [2019, 2021] and all experiments are conducted in the latent space. The dataset consists of 15 classes, and we chose 10 classes for the experiments which seem to

follow a normal distribution. The datasets used in our experiments are listed in Appendix C.4. Before conducting the experiments, All datasets are standarized with each feature having mean 0 and variance 1. In this experiment, we employed a ResNet model as a feature extractor. This model was pre-trained by Bergman et al. [2020]. on the ImageNet dataset for kNNAD in the latent space.

As a preprocessing step, the original image, which has a size of  $900 \times 900$ , was divided into  $30 \times 30$  patches, and the patch was used as the test instance. For the training instances, we used 100 patches from the same position as the test instance. We set the number of neighbors k = 1. The results of the type I error rate and power are shown in Figure 6. The Stat-kNNAD method outperformed the other methods in terms of power, while controlling the type I error rate below the significance level.



(b) Type I Error Rate for Adaptively Selected  $\boldsymbol{k}$ 

Figure 4: Results of the experiments on tabular datasets. The two figures show the type I error rate. The proposed method (Stat-kNNAD) controlled the type I error rate below the significance level across all datasets. The type I error rate of the **bonferroni** are almost zero, because it is too conservative.





(b) Power for Adaptively Selected  $\boldsymbol{k}$ 

Figure 5: Results of the experiments on tabular datasets. The two figures show the power. The proposed method (Stat-kNNAD) outperformed the other methods in terms of power, across all datasets. The power of the bonferroni are almost zero, because it is too conservative.



(a) Type I Error Rate Results on Image Data



(b) Power Results on Image Data

Figure 6: Results of the experiments on image datasets. The proposed method (Stat-kNNAD) outperformed the other methods in terms of power, while controlling the type I error rate below the significance level. The type I error rate and power of the **bonferroni** are almost zero, because it is too conservative.

# 7 Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a k-NN-based anomaly detection method that theoretically controls the false detection probability within a desired significance level. The proposed Stat-kNNAD method is applicable both in the original feature space and in the latent feature space learned by a pretrained deep learning model. Applying the proposed method to real-world tabular and image data demonstrates its ability to achieve statistically significant and reliable anomaly detection. However, as discussed in §5, the proposed method has certain limitations, and future work will focus on extending the theory and methods of SI to develop a more flexible approach.

## Acknowledgement

This work was partially supported by MEXT KAKENHI (20H00601), JST CREST (JPMJCR21D3, JPMJCR22N2), JST Moonshot R&D (JPMJMS2033-05), JST AIP Acceleration Research (JPMJCR21U2), NEDO (JPNP18002, JPNP20006) and RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project.

# A Proof of Theorem 1

Firstly, we show that the conditional distribution

$$T(\boldsymbol{Y}) \mid \{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}}\}$$

is a truncated normal distribution. Let we define the two vectors  $\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)d}$ as  $\boldsymbol{a} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{b} = \tilde{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta} / \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} \tilde{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ , respectively. Then, from the condition on  $\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Leftrightarrow \left( I_{(n+1)d} - \frac{\tilde{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} \tilde{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \boldsymbol{Y} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{a} + \boldsymbol{b} \boldsymbol{z},$$

where  $z = T(\mathbf{Y}) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus, we have

$$\{ \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)d} \mid \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}} \}$$
$$= \{ \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)d} \mid \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}z, z \in \mathbb{R} \}$$
$$= \{ \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}z \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)d} \mid \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}z} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}z} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}z} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}}, z \in \mathbb{R} \}$$
$$= \{ \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}z \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)d} \mid z \in \mathcal{Z} \},$$

where truncated interval  $\mathcal{Z}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{ z \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathcal{N}_{a+bz} = \mathcal{N}_{y}, \mathcal{K}_{a+bz} = \mathcal{K}_{y}, \mathcal{S}_{a+bz} = \mathcal{S}_{y} \}.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$T(\boldsymbol{Y}) \mid \{ \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \} \sim \mathrm{TN}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{Z}}),$$

which is the truncated normal distribution with the mean  $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , the variance  $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top}\tilde{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\eta}$ , and the truncation intervals  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

From the above result, we can compute the selective p-value as defined in Eq. (10) by using the truncated normal distribution. Therefore, by probability integral transformation, under the null hypothesis, we have

$$p_{\text{selective}} \mid \{ \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1),$$

which leads to

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_0}\left(p_{\text{selective}} \leq \alpha \mid \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}}\right) = \alpha, \ \forall \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , by marginalizing over all the values of the nuisance parameters, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_{0}}\left(p_{\text{selective}} \leq \alpha \mid \mathcal{N}_{Y} = \mathcal{N}_{y}, \mathcal{K}_{Y} = \mathcal{K}_{y}, \mathcal{S}_{Y} = \mathcal{S}_{y}\right)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n'}} \mathbb{P}_{H_{0}}\left(p_{\text{selective}} \leq \alpha \mid \mathcal{N}_{Y} = \mathcal{N}_{y}, \mathcal{K}_{Y} = \mathcal{K}_{y}, \mathcal{S}_{Y} = \mathcal{S}_{y}, \mathcal{Q}_{Y} = \mathcal{Q}_{y}\right)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_{0}}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{Y} = \mathcal{Q}_{y} \mid \mathcal{N}_{Y} = \mathcal{N}_{y}, \mathcal{K}_{Y} = \mathcal{K}_{y}, \mathcal{S}_{Y} = \mathcal{S}_{y}, \right) d\mathcal{Q}_{y}$$

$$= \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^{(n+1)d}} \mathbb{P}_{H_{0}}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{Y} = \mathcal{Q}_{y} \mid \mathcal{N}_{Y} = \mathcal{N}_{y}, \mathcal{K}_{Y} = \mathcal{K}_{y}, \mathcal{S}_{Y} = \mathcal{S}_{y}\right) d\mathcal{Q}_{y} = \alpha.$$

Therefore, we also obtain

 $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{H}_0}(p_{\mathrm{selective}} \leq \alpha)$ 

$$= \sum_{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \in 2^{[n]}} \sum_{\mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \in \{-1,1\}^d} \mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}})$$
$$\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(p_{\text{selective}} \leq \alpha \mid \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}})$$

$$= \alpha \sum_{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \in 2^{[n]}} \sum_{\mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \in \{-1,1\}^d} \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{H}_0}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}) = \alpha.$$

# B Selection Events of the Deep Learning Models

We explain the selection events regarding the deep learning model that transforms an image instance  $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  to a latent feature vector  $\boldsymbol{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{d}}$ . We consider a deep learning model that consists of sequential piecewise-linear functions (e.g., convolution, ReLU activation, max pooling, and up-sampling). Obviously, the composite function of those piecewise-linear functions maintains its piecewiselinear nature. Thus, within a specific real space in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the deep learning model simplifies to a linear function, which can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{DL}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \boldsymbol{B} + \boldsymbol{W} \boldsymbol{x}_i \quad \text{if } \boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathcal{P},$$

where  $\boldsymbol{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{d}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{d}}$  represent the bias and weight matrices, and  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d}$  is a polytope where  $\mathcal{A}_{DL}$  acts as a linear function. The polytope can be characterized by a set of linear inequalities. For details on computing these linear inequalities, see Katsuoka et al. [2025]. Let the selection event denote the set of polytopes for all instances in  $\boldsymbol{Y}$ :

$$\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} := \{ \mathcal{P} \mid \boldsymbol{X}_i \in \boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{X}_i \in \mathcal{P} \}.$$

For kNNAD using feature representations from the deep learning model, we can compute the selective *p*-value by adding the conditioning  $\mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$  into Eq.(10), as follows:

$$p_{\text{selective}} := \mathbb{P}_{H_0}\left(T(\boldsymbol{Y}) \geq T(\boldsymbol{y}) | \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}, \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{Y}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{y}}\right)$$

## **C** Details of the Experiments

#### C.1 Additional Type I Error Rate Results

We also conducted experiments to investigate the type I error rate when the data dimension d and the number of neighbors k were changed. Specifically, we changed  $d \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$  and  $k \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$ , while setting the default parameters as n = 100, d = 2, and k = 1. In addition, experiments with changing d were also considered the case where k was selected adaptively from  $\{1, 2, 5, 10\}$  in a data-driven manner. In all cases, we generated the datasets in the same way as in the experiments on synthetic datasets (§6.2), and the results are shown in Figure 7.



Figure 7: Type I error rate when changing the data dimension d and the number of neighbors k. Our proposed method (Stat-kNNAD), the ablation study (w/o-pp), and the Bonferroni method (bonferroni) successfully control the type I error rate across all settings. However, the naive method (naive) fails. The results of the bonferroni are almost zero, because it is too conservative.

#### C.2 Additional Power Results

We also conducted experiments to investigate the power when the number of training data n, the data dimension d and the number of neighbors k are changed. We changed  $n \in \{100, 200, 500, 1000\}, d \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$  and  $k \in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$  while setting the default parameters as n = 100, d = 2, k = 1 and signal strength  $\delta = 5$ . Furthermore, we conducted additional experiments

where n and d was changed, considering the case where k was adaptively selected from  $\in \{1, 2, 5, 10\}$  in a data-driven manner. In all cases, we generated the datasets in the same way as in the experiments on synthetic datasets (§6.2), and the results are shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9.



Figure 8: Power for a fixed number of neighbors k. The results show the effect of changing the training dataset size n, the data dimension d, and k. Our proposed method (Stat-kNNAD) outperformed other methods across all settings.



Figure 9: Power for an adaptively selected number of neighbors k. The results show the effect of changing the training dataset size n and the data dimension d. Our proposed method (Stat-kNNAD) outperformed other methods across all settings.

#### C.3 Details of Tabular Datasets

We used the following 10 real datasets from the Kaggle Repository. All datasets are licensed under the CC BY 4.0 license.

- Heart: Dataset for predicting heart attacks
- Money: Dataset on financial transactions in a virtual environment
- Fire: Dataset on fires in the MUGLA region in June
- Cancer: Dataset related to breast cancer diagnosis
- Credit: Dataset on credit card transactions
- Student: Dataset related to student performance
- Bankruptcy: Dataset on company bankruptcies
- Drink: Dataset on the quality of drinking water
- Nuclear: Dataset on pressurized nuclear reactors
- Network: Dataset on anomaly detection in virtual network environments

#### C.4 Experimental Results on Image Data Examples

We evaluated Stat-kNNAD and naive on the 10 datasets from MVTec AD dataset. The datasets used in this study are *Carpet, Grid, Leather, Tile, Wood, Bottle, Capsule, Metal Nut, Transistor, and Zipper.* Examples from each dataset are shown in Figure 10. In each example, we present patches corresponding to true negative and true positive cases, along with both the naive *p*-value and the selective *p*-value.





Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ = Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ =0.011,  $p_{selective} = 0.250$ 0.031,  $p_{selective} = 0.491$ Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ = Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ 0.001,  $p_{selective} = 0.022$ 0.001,  $p_{selective} = 0.013$ 





Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ = Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ =0.040,  $p_{selective} = 0.640$ 0.011,  $p_{selective} = 0.309$ Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ = Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ 0.004,  $p_{selective} = 0.021$ 0.009,  $p_{selective} = 0.046$ 



Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ = Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ =0.028,  $p_{selective} = 0.488$ 0.027,  $p_{selective} = 0.460$ Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ =3333330.001,  $p_{selective} = 0.034$ 0.003,  $p_{selective} = 0.017$ 



Capsule

Metal Nut



Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ = Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ =0.026,  $p_{selective} = 0.505$ 0.010,  $p_{selective} = 0.283$ Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ = Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ 0.002,  $p_{selective} = 0.047$ 0.009,  $p_{selective} = 0.038$ 





Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ = Normal Example (Left): $p_{naive}$ =0.017,  $p_{selective} = 0.585$ 0.030,  $p_{selective} = 0.471$ Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ = Anomaly Example (Right): $p_{naive}$ 0.001,  $p_{selective} = 0.015$ 0.001,  $p_{selective} = 0.048$ 

Figure 10: Experimental results of 10 datasets from MVTec AD dataset. For each dataset, one normal example (left) and one anomaly example (right) are showed. For each example, the top row displays the original image used for testing along with the patch location (marked in red), while the bottom row presents the extracted patch image. For all normal examples, the naive *p*-value is below the significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$  (false positive), whereas the proposed selective *p*-value correctly results in a true negative. For all anomaly examples, the selective *p*-value successfully detects anomalies.



Figure 11: Experimental results on the *Bottle* image from the MVTec AD dataset. For the normal image (left), the conventional *p*-value falls below the significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ , leading to a false positive, whereas the proposed selective *p*-value correctly indicates a true negative. For the anomaly image (right), the proposed method accurately detects the anomaly.

## References

- V Barnett. Outliers in statistical data. John Wiley & Sons google schola, 2: 705−708, 1994.
- Yoav Benjamini. Selective inference: The silent killer of replicability. 2020.
- Liron Bergman, Niv Cohen, and Yedid Hoshen. Deep nearest neighbor anomaly detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10445, 2020.
- Paul Bergmann, Michael Fauser, David Sattlegger, and Carsten Steger. Mvtec ad–a comprehensive real-world dataset for unsupervised anomaly detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 9592–9600, 2019.
- Paul Bergmann, Kilian Batzner, Michael Fauser, David Sattlegger, and Carsten Steger. The mytec anomaly detection dataset: a comprehensive real-world dataset for unsupervised anomaly detection. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129(4):1038–1059, 2021.
- Leo Breiman. The little bootstrap and other methods for dimensionality selection in regression: X-fixed prediction error. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 87(419):738–754, 1992.
- Markus M Breunig, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Raymond T Ng, and Jörg Sander. Lof: identifying density-based local outliers. In Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data, pages 93–104, 2000.
- Raghavendra Chalapathy and Sanjay Chawla. Deep learning for anomaly detection: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.03407*, 2019.
- Varun Chandola, Arindam Banerjee, and Vipin Kumar. Anomaly detection: A survey. ACM computing surveys (CSUR), 41(3):1–58, 2009.
- Shuxiao Chen and Jacob Bien. Valid inference corrected for outlier removal. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, pages 1–12, 2019.

- Miwa Daiki, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Valid p-value for deep learning-driven salient region. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Diptesh Das, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, Hiroyuki Hanada, Koji Tsuda, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Fast and more powerful selective inference for sparse high-order interaction model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04929*, 2021.
- Vo Nguyen Le Duy and Ichiro Takeuchi. More powerful conditional selective inference for generalized lasso by parametric programming. The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 23(1):13544–13580, 2022.
- Vo Nguyen Le Duy, Hiroki Toda, Ryota Sugiyama, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Computing valid p-value for optimal changepoint by selective inference using dynamic programming. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pages 11356–11367, 2020.
- Vo Nguyen Le Duy, Shogo Iwazaki, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Quantifying statistical significance of neural network-based image segmentation by selective inference. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2022.
- William Fithian, Dennis Sun, and Jonathan Taylor. Optimal inference after model selection. arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.2597, 2014.
- Lucy L Gao, Jacob Bien, and Daniela Witten. Selective inference for hierarchical clustering. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–11, 2022.
- Sangwon Hyun, Max G'sell, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Exact post-selection inference for the generalized lasso path. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 12(1): 1053–1097, 2018.
- Sangwon Hyun, Kevin Z Lin, Max G'Sell, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Post-selection inference for changepoint detection algorithms with application to copy number variation data. *Biometrics*, 77(3):1037–1049, 2021.

- Sean Jewell, Paul Fearnhead, and Daniela Witten. Testing for a change in mean after changepoint detection. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology, 84(4):1082–1104, 2022.
- Teruyuki Katsuoka, Tomohiro Shiraishi, Daiki Miwa, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Statistical test for generated hypotheses by diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11789*, 2024.
- Teruyuki Katsuoka, Tomohiro Shiraishi, Daiki Miwa, Shuichi Nishino, and Ichiro Takeuchi. si4onnx: A python package for selective inference in deep learning models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17415, 2025.
- Nikolaus Kriegeskorte, W Kyle Simmons, Patrick SF Bellgowan, and Chris I Baker. Circular analysis in systems neuroscience: the dangers of double dipping. *Nature neuroscience*, 12(5):535–540, 2009.
- Vo Nguyen Le Duy and Ichiro Takeuchi. Parametric programming approach for more powerful and general lasso selective inference. In *International confer*ence on artificial intelligence and statistics, pages 901–909. PMLR, 2021.
- Vo Nguyen Le Duy, Hsuan-Tien Lin, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Cad-da: Controllable anomaly detection after domain adaptation by statistical inference. In International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, pages 1828–1836. PMLR, 2024.
- Jason D Lee, Yuekai Sun, and Jonathan E Taylor. Evaluating the statistical significance of biclusters. Advances in neural information processing systems, 28, 2015.
- Jason D Lee, Dennis L Sun, Yuekai Sun, and Jonathan E Taylor. Exact postselection inference, with application to the lasso. 2016.
- Chun-Liang Li, Kihyuk Sohn, Jinsung Yoon, and Tomas Pfister. Cutpaste: Selfsupervised learning for anomaly detection and localization. In *Proceedings of* the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 9664–9674, 2021.

- Fei Tony Liu, Kai Ming Ting, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Isolation forest. In 2008 eighth ieee international conference on data mining, pages 413–422. IEEE, 2008.
- Kishan G Mehrotra, Chilukuri K Mohan, HuaMing Huang, Kishan G Mehrotra, Chilukuri K Mohan, and HuaMing Huang. *Anomaly detection*. Springer, 2017.
- Daiki Miwa, Tomohiro Shiraishi, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, Teruyuki Katsuoka, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Statistical test for anomaly detections by variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03724*, 2024.
- Douglas C Montgomery. Introduction to statistical quality control. John wiley & sons, 2020.
- Sridhar Ramaswamy, Rajeev Rastogi, and Kyuseok Shim. Efficient algorithms for mining outliers from large data sets. In Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data, pages 427–438, 2000.
- David Rügamer and Sonja Greven. Inference for 1 2-boosting. *Statistics and computing*, 30(2):279–289, 2020.
- David Rügamer, Philipp FM Baumann, and Sonja Greven. Selective inference for additive and linear mixed models. *Computational Statistics & Data Anal*ysis, 167:107350, 2022.
- Bernhard Schölkopf, John C Platt, John Shawe-Taylor, Alex J Smola, and Robert C Williamson. Estimating the support of a high-dimensional distribution. *Neural computation*, 13(7):1443–1471, 2001.
- Tomohiro Shiraishi, Daiki Miwa, Teruyuki Katsuoka, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, Kouichi Taji, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Statistical test for attention maps in vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2024a.
- Tomohiro Shiraishi, Daiki Miwa, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Selective inference for change point detection by recurrent neural network. *Neural Computation*, 37(1):160–192, 2024b.

- Kazuya Sugiyama, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, and Ichiro Takeuchi. More powerful and general selective inference for stepwise feature selection using the homotopy continuation approach. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference* on Machine Learning, 2021.
- Shinya Suzumura, Kazuya Nakagawa, Yuta Umezu, Koji Tsuda, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Selective inference for sparse high-order interaction models. In Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70, pages 3338–3347. JMLR. org, 2017.
- Kosuke Tanizaki, Noriaki Hashimoto, Yu Inatsu, Hidekata Hontani, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Computing valid p-values for image segmentation by selective inference. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 9553–9562, 2020.
- Jonathan Taylor and Robert J Tibshirani. Statistical learning and selective inference. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112(25):7629– 7634, 2015.
- Ryan J Tibshirani, Jonathan Taylor, Richard Lockhart, and Robert Tibshirani. Exact post-selection inference for sequential regression procedures. *Journal* of the American Statistical Association, 111(514):600–620, 2016.
- Toshiaki Tsukurimichi, Yu Inatsu, Vo Nguyen Le Duy, and Ichiro Takeuchi. Conditional selective inference for robust regression and outlier detection using piecewise-linear homotopy continuation. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 74(6):1197–1228, 2022.
- Fan Yang, Rina Foygel Barber, Prateek Jain, and John Lafferty. Selective inference for group-sparse linear models. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pages 2469–2477, 2016.