

# <sup>1</sup> nonconform: Conformal Anomaly Detection (Python)

<sup>2</sup> Oliver Hennhöfer  <sup>1</sup>

<sup>3</sup> 1 Intelligent Systems Research Group, Karlsruhe University of Applied Sciences, Karlsruhe, Germany

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

## Software

- [Review](#) 
- [Repository](#) 
- [Archive](#) 

Editor: [Open Journals](#) 

Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

## License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

## <sup>4</sup> Summary

<sup>5</sup> Quantifying uncertainty is fundamental for AI systems in safety-critical, high-cost-of-error domains, as reliable decision-making depends on it. The Python package `nonconform` offers <sup>6</sup> statistically principled uncertainty quantification for semi-supervised anomaly detection based <sup>7</sup> on one-class classification (Tax, 2001). It implements methods from conformal anomaly <sup>8</sup> detection (Bates et al., 2023; Jin & Candès, 2025; Laxhammar & Falkman, 2010), grounded in <sup>9</sup> conformal inference (Lei & Wasserman, 2013; Papadopoulos et al., 2002; Vovk et al., 2005). <sup>10</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The package `nonconform` calibrates anomaly detection models to produce statistically valid <sup>12</sup>  $p$ -values from raw anomaly scores. Conformal calibration uses a hold-out set  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}$  of size  $n$  <sup>13</sup> containing normal instances, while the model is trained on a separate normal dataset. For a <sup>14</sup> new observation  $X_{n+1}$  with anomaly score  $\hat{s}(X_{n+1})$ , the  $p$ -value is computed by comparing <sup>15</sup> this score to the empirical distribution of calibration scores  $\hat{s}(X_i)$  for  $i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}$ . The conformal <sup>16</sup>  $p$ -value  $\hat{u}(X_{n+1})$  is calculated by ranking the new score among the calibration scores augmented <sup>17</sup> by the test score itself (Bates et al., 2023; Liang et al., 2024): <sup>18</sup>

$$\hat{u}(X_{n+1}) = \frac{1 + |\{i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}} : \hat{s}(X_i) \leq \hat{s}(X_{n+1})\}|}{n + 1}.$$

<sup>19</sup> The package also supports randomized smoothing (Jin & Candès, 2025) to produce continuous <sup>20</sup>  $p$ -values without the discrete resolution floor of  $1/(n + 1)$ .

<sup>21</sup> By framing anomaly detection as a sequence of statistical hypothesis tests, these  $p$ -values <sup>22</sup> enable systematic control of the *marginal* (average) false discovery rate (FDR) (Benjamini <sup>23</sup> & Hochberg, 1995). For standard exchangeable data, conformal  $p$ -values satisfy the PRDS <sup>24</sup> property, allowing the use of the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure (Bates et al., 2023). The <sup>25</sup> library integrates seamlessly with the widely used `pyod` library (Chen et al., 2025; Zhao et al., 2019), extending conformal techniques to a broad range of anomaly detection models.

## <sup>26</sup> Statement of Need

<sup>27</sup> A major challenge in anomaly detection lies in setting an appropriate anomaly threshold, as <sup>28</sup> it directly influences the false positive rate. In high-stakes domains such as fraud detection, <sup>29</sup> medical diagnostics, and industrial quality control, excessive false alarms can lead to *alert* <sup>30</sup> *fatigue* and render systems impractical.

<sup>31</sup> The package `nonconform` mitigates this issue by replacing raw anomaly scores with  $p$ -values, <sup>32</sup> enabling formal control of the FDR. Consequently, conformal methods become effectively <sup>33</sup> *threshold-free*, since anomaly thresholds are implicitly determined by underlying statistical <sup>34</sup> procedures.

$$FDR = \frac{\text{Efforts Wasted on False Alarms}}{\text{Total Efforts}}$$

35 (Benjamini et al., 2009)

36 Conformal methods are *nonparametric* and *model-agnostic*, applying to any model that  
37 produces consistent anomaly scores on arbitrarily distributed data. Their key requirement is  
38 the assumption of *exchangeability* between calibration and test data, ensuring the validity of  
39 resulting conformal *p*-values.

40 Exchangeability only requires that the joint data distribution is invariant under permutations,  
41 making it more general—and less restrictive—than the independent and identically distributed  
42 (*i.i.d.*) assumption common in classical machine learning.

43 To operationalize this assumption, nonconform constructs calibration sets from training data  
44 using several strategies, including approaches for low-data regimes (Hennhofer & Preisach,  
45 2024) that do not require a dedicated hold-out set. Based on these calibration sets, the  
46 package computes *standard* or *weighted* conformal *p*-values (Jin & Candès, 2025), which  
47 address scenarios of covariate shift where the assumption of exchangeability is violated. Under  
48 covariate shift, specialized weighted selection procedures are required to maintain FDR control  
49 (Jin & Candès, 2025). These tools enable practitioners to build anomaly detectors whose  
50 outputs are statistically controlled to maintain the FDR at a chosen nominal level.

51 Overall, reliance on exchangeability makes these methods well-suited to cross-sectional data  
52 but less appropriate for time series applications, where temporal ordering conveys essential  
53 information.

## 54 Acknowledgements

55 This work was conducted in part under the research projects *Biflex Industrie* (Grant no.  
56 01MV23020A) funded by the *German Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Action*.

## 57 References

- 58 Bates, S., Candès, E., Lei, L., Romano, Y., & Sesia, M. (2023). Testing for outliers with  
59 conformal *p*-values. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(1). <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-aos2244>
- 60 Benjamini, Y., Heller, R., & Yekutieli, D. (2009). Selective inference in complex research.  
61 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering  
62 Sciences*, 367(1906), 4255–4271. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2009.0127>
- 63 Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and  
64 powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B  
65 (Methodological)*, 57(1), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>
- 66 Chen, S., Qian, Z., Siu, W., Hu, X., Li, J., Li, S., Qin, Y., Yang, T., Xiao, Z., Ye, W., Zhang,  
67 Y., Dong, Y., & Zhao, Y. (2025). PyOD 2: A python library for outlier detection with  
68 LLM-powered model selection. *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference  
69 2025*, 2807–2810. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3701716.3715196>
- 70 Hennhofer, O., & Preisach, C. (2024). Leave-One-Out-, Bootstrap- and Cross-Conformal  
71 Anomaly Detectors . *2024 IEEE International Conference on Knowledge Graph (ICKG)*,  
72 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICKG63256.2024.00022>
- 73 Jin, Y., & Candès, E. J. (2025). Model-free selective inference under covariate shift via weighted  
74 conformal *p*-values. *Biometrika*, asaf066. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asaf066>
- 75 Laxhammar, R., & Falkman, G. (2010). Conformal prediction for distribution-independent  
76 anomaly detection in streaming vessel data. *Proceedings of the First International Workshop  
77 on Novel Data Stream Pattern Mining Techniques*, 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1833280.1833287>

- 79 Lei, J., & Wasserman, L. (2013). Distribution-free prediction bands for non-parametric  
80 regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(1),  
81 71–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12021>
- 82 Liang, Z., Sesia, M., & Sun, W. (2024). Integrative conformal p-values for out-of-distribution  
83 testing with labelled outliers. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical  
84 Methodology*, 86(3), 671–693. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrssb/qkad138>
- 85 Papadopoulos, H., Proedrou, K., Vovk, V., & Gammerman, A. (2002). Inductive confidence  
86 machines for regression. In *Machine learning: ECML 2002* (pp. 345–356). Springer Berlin  
87 Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36755-1\\_29](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36755-1_29)
- 88 Tax, D. (2001). *One-class classification; concept-learning in the absence of counter-examples*  
89 [Dissertation (TU Delft)]. Delft University of Technology. ISBN: 90-75691-05-X
- 90 Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., & Shafer, G. (2005). *Algorithmic learning in a random world*.  
91 Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/b106715>
- 92 Zhao, Y., Nasrullah, Z., & Li, Z. (2019). PyOD: A python toolbox for scalable outlier detection.  
93 <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1901.01588>

DRAFT