




# nonconform: Conformal Anomaly Detection (Python)

Oliver Hennhöfer <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Intelligent Systems Research Group (ISRG), Karlsruhe University of Applied Sciences (HKA),  
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Published: unpublished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](#))

## Summary

The Python package `nonconform` provides statistically principled uncertainty quantification for unsupervised anomaly detection. It implements methods from conformal anomaly detection (Bates et al., 2023; Jin & Candès, 2023; Laxhammar & Falkman, 2010) based on the principles of one-class classification (Petsche & Gluck, 1994). The ability to quantify uncertainty is a fundamental requirement for AI systems in safety-critical domains, where reliable decision-making is essential.

Based on the underlying principles of conformal inference (Lei & Wasserman, 2013; Papadopoulos et al., 2002; Vovk et al., 2005), `nonconform` converts raw anomaly scores from an underlying detection model into statistically valid  $p$ -values. This is achieved by calibrating the model on a hold-out set of normal data; the  $p$ -value for a new test instance is then calculated as the relative rank of its anomaly score compared to the scores from the calibration set. By framing anomaly detection as a series of statistical hypothesis tests, these  $p$ -values allow for the systematic control of the False Discovery Rate (FDR) (Bates et al., 2023; Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995) at a pre-defined significance level (e.g.,  $\alpha \leq 0.1$ ). The library integrates with the popular `pyod` library (Chen et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2019), making it easy to apply these conformal techniques to a wide range of anomaly detection models.

## Statement of Need

A primary challenge in anomaly detection is setting an appropriate anomaly threshold, which directly impacts the false positive rate. In high-stakes domains such as fraud detection, medical diagnostics, and industrial quality control, controlling the proportion of false positives is crucial, as frequent false alarms can lead to *alert fatigue* and render a system impractical. The `nonconform` package addresses this by replacing raw anomaly scores with  $p$ -values, which enables formal FDR control. This makes the conformal methods *threshold-free*, as decision thresholds are a direct result of respective statistical procedures.

Moreover, conformal methods are *non-parametric* and *model-agnostic*, making them compatible with any model that produces consistent anomaly scores. The `nonconform` package provides a range of strategies for creating the calibration set from training data. With this calibration set, the package can compute standard conformal  $p$ -values or modified *weighted* conformal  $p$ -values (Jin & Candès, 2023), which are more robust in low-data regimes (Hennhöfer & Preisach, 2024). Weighted  $p$ -values are particularly useful when the statistical assumption of exchangeability is weakened by covariate shift between calibration and test data. By providing these tools, `nonconform` enables researchers and practitioners to build anomaly detectors whose outputs are statistically controlled to cap the FDR at a desired nominal level.

The core assumption for the methods in `nonconform` is that the data is exchangeable, meaning the joint probability distribution is invariant to the order of observations. This makes the

41 methods suitable for many cross-sectional data analysis tasks but not for time-series data  
42 where temporal ordering is informative.

## 43 Acknowledgements

44 This work was conducted in part within the research projects *Biflex Industrie* (grant number  
45 01MV23020A) and *AutoDiagCM* (grant number 03EE2046B) funded by the *German Federal*  
46 *Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK)*.

47 Bates, S., Candès, E., Lei, L., Romano, Y., & Sesia, M. (2023). Testing for outliers with  
48 conformal p-values. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(1). <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-aos2244>

49 Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and  
50 powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*  
51 *(Methodological)*, 57(1), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2346101>

52 Chen, S., Qian, Z., Siu, W., Hu, X., Li, J., Li, S., Qin, Y., Yang, T., Xiao, Z., Ye, W., Zhang,  
53 Y., Dong, Y., & Zhao, Y. (2024). PyOD 2: A python library for outlier detection with  
54 LLM-powered model selection. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2412.12154*.

55 Hennhofer, O., & Preisach, C. (2024). Leave-One-Out-, Bootstrap- and Cross-Conformal  
56 Anomaly Detectors . *2024 IEEE International Conference on Knowledge Graph (ICKG)*,  
57 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICKG63256.2024.00022>

58 Jin, Y., & Candès, E. J. (2023). *Model-free selective inference under covariate shift via*  
59 *weighted conformal p-values*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259950903>

60 Laxhammar, R., & Falkman, G. (2010). Conformal prediction for distribution-independent  
61 anomaly detection in streaming vessel data. *Proceedings of the First International Workshop*  
62 *on Novel Data Stream Pattern Mining Techniques*, 47–55. [https://doi.org/10.1145/](https://doi.org/10.1145/1833280.1833287)  
63 [1833280.1833287](https://doi.org/10.1145/1833280.1833287)

64 Lei, J., & Wasserman, L. (2013). Distribution-free prediction bands for non-parametric  
65 regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(1),  
66 71–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12021>

67 Papadopoulos, H., Proedrou, K., Vovk, V., & Gammerman, A. (2002). Inductive confidence  
68 machines for regression. In *Machine learning: ECML 2002* (pp. 345–356). Springer Berlin  
69 Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36755-1\\_29](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36755-1_29)

70 Petsche, T., & Gluck, M. (1994). Workshop on novelty detection and adaptive system  
71 monitoring. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.

72 Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., & Shafer, G. (2005). *Algorithmic learning in a random world*.  
73 Springer-Verlag. ISBN: 0387001522

74 Zhao, Y., Nasrullah, Z., & Li, Z. (2019). PyOD: A python toolbox for scalable outlier detection.  
75 *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(96), 1–7. [http://jmlr.org/papers/v20/19-011.](http://jmlr.org/papers/v20/19-011.html)  
76 [html](http://jmlr.org/papers/v20/19-011.html)