

# GradPCA: Leveraging NTK Alignment for Reliable Out-of-Distribution Detection

Mariia Seleznova<sup>1\*</sup> Hung-Hsu Chou<sup>2</sup> Claudio Mayrink Verdun<sup>3</sup> Gitta Kutyniok<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München <sup>2</sup>University of Pittsburgh <sup>3</sup>Harvard University

## Abstract

We introduce **GradPCA**, an Out-of-Distribution (OOD) detection method that exploits the low-rank structure of neural network gradients induced by Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) alignment. GradPCA applies Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to gradient class-means, achieving more consistent performance than existing methods across standard image classification benchmarks. We provide a theoretical perspective on spectral OOD detection in neural networks to support GradPCA, highlighting feature-space properties that enable effective detection and naturally emerge from NTK alignment. Our analysis further reveals that feature quality—particularly the use of pretrained versus non-pretrained representations—plays a crucial role in determining which detectors will succeed. Extensive experiments validate the strong performance of GradPCA, and our theoretical framework offers guidance for designing more principled spectral OOD detectors.

**Keywords** — Out-of-Distribution (OOD) detection, Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK)

## 1 Introduction

In modern deep learning, models often produce confident but incorrect predictions when presented with inputs outside their training distribution [1, 2, 3]. Out-of-Distribution (OOD) detection provides a mechanism for models to *know when they don't know*, enabling them to reject inputs beyond their domain of competence. As deep learning systems become integrated into critical decision-making processes, robust OOD detection is essential for ensuring safety and effective human oversight [4].

Although designed to improve the reliability of deep learning, OOD detection methods have themselves proven unreliable [5, 6]. Their performance often hinges on subtle assumptions about the model, data, and training procedure, with little theoretical guidance as to when these assumptions hold. As a result, OOD detection effectiveness is typically assessed through empirical validation alone, making the performance difficult to predict and dependent on ad hoc tuning. In response to these challenges, we propose a new OOD detection method that combines classical spectral analysis with recent insights into deep learning theory, offering a principled and interpretable approach.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- **GradPCA:** Our method leverages the low-rank structure of gradients in well-trained neural networks (NNs), induced by the *Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) alignment* phenomenon [7, 8, 9, 10]. Under NTK alignment, gradients of in-distribution (ID) inputs concentrate within stable, low-dimensional subspaces spanned by class-specific directions. GradPCA performs PCA on gradient class-means to efficiently model this subspace and flag inputs whose gradients fall outside it. GradPCA is the first OOD detector to exploit NTK alignment, and its principled design ensures robust performance across realistic detection scenarios.

\*Correspondence to: Mariia Seleznova (selez@math.lmu.de).

- **Revisiting spectral OOD detection:** We present a theoretical framework that extends the principles of classical and kernel PCA [11, 12, 13] to neural networks (NNs) by focusing on the choice of *feature space*—such as logits, activations, or gradients. This framework identifies key properties of feature spaces that support reliable spectral OOD detection, and naturally emerge in gradient space via NTK alignment. Our perspective offers an interpretation of GradPCA’s empirical success, clarifies the effectiveness of feature spaces used in prior work, and provides guidelines for designing future spectral OOD detectors.
- **Feature quality matters for OOD detection:** By categorizing and evaluating existing OOD detection methods, we find that OOD detection performance critically depends on the quality of feature representations—specifically, whether they come from general-purpose (pretrained) or task-specific (non-pretrained) models. Methods that flag abnormal model behavior (e.g., confidence-based scores) often *worsen* as feature quality improves, whereas approaches that exploit geometric regularities in feature space typically *benefit*. This underexplored factor helps reconcile inconsistencies in prior results and underscores the importance of accounting for feature quality when designing future OOD detectors.
- **Empirical validation and open-source implementation:**<sup>2</sup> We evaluate GradPCA exclusively on *publicly available pretrained models* and *community-released OOD benchmarks*, deliberately avoiding manual subset selection or ad hoc model training. This principled setup mitigates common evaluation biases and enables fair comparison across diverse settings. GradPCA delivers the most consistent performance—achieving near state-of-the-art results across all benchmarks—while many strong baselines show significant variability depending on model or dataset choice. To support reproducibility and future work, we publicly release our code and experimental configurations.

**Notation and outline.** We denote vectors and matrices by bold lowercase and uppercase letters, respectively (e.g.,  $\mathbf{w}$  for a vector and  $\mathbf{F}$  for a matrix). Bold numerals such as  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  represent vectors of zeros and ones. The indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_A(x)$  equals 1 if  $x \in A$  and 0 otherwise. We denote the in-distribution and out-distribution probability density functions by  $d\mu_{\text{id}}$  and  $d\mu_{\text{ood}}$ , with corresponding measures  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  and  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ . The support of  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  is defined as  $\text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}}) := \{x : d\mu_{\text{id}}(x) > 0\}$ .

We present the OOD detection problem setup in Section 2, GradPCA and key empirical insights in Section 3, theory in Section 4, experimental setup in Section 5, and conclude with Section 6.

## 2 OOD Detection: Problem Setup and Methods

Before presenting our method, we formulate the OOD detection problem and introduce our categorisation of existing OOD detection approaches to contextualise GradPCA.

**Problem formulation.** The goal of OOD detection is to construct a detector  $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  that returns  $D(x) = 0$  if  $x \sim \mu_{\text{id}}$  and  $D(x) = 1$  if  $x \sim \mu_{\text{ood}}$ , for arbitrary  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ . However, this problem is fundamentally ill-posed: no detector is universally optimal across all possible  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$  (see Appendix B.1). To make the problem well-posed, we reformulate it as *support recovery*: identifying the support of  $\mu_{\text{id}}$ , denoted  $\text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})$ . In this setting, the optimal detector is  $D^* := \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{X} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})}$ , which flags any input outside the support of  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  as OOD. We adopt this support-based perspective throughout and refer to any  $x \notin \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})$  as *guaranteed* OOD—independent of  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ . This view aligns with practice: an input is effectively ID only if the model can correctly classify it, reinforcing that OOD detection should focus on the boundaries of reliable model behavior rather than distributional likelihoods.

**Taxonomy of OOD detectors.** The vast body of work on OOD detection makes it challenging to precisely categorize existing approaches. However, for the purposes of this paper, we find it helpful to broadly classify existing methods into two categories based on their main *assumptions*:

- **Regularity-based:** These methods assume that ID data occupies a compact region or lies on a structured manifold in a suitable *feature space*. A sample is flagged as OOD if it deviates significantly from this “regular” region. Classical approaches such as density estimation and (kernel) PCA fall into this category, as do neural OOD detection methods such as Mahalanobis [14] and KNN [15]. Our method, GradPCA, also belongs to this class.

<sup>2</sup>The code is available to reviewers during the review process and will be released publicly upon acceptance.

- **Abnormality-based:** These methods instead focus on identifying “abnormality”—patterns or behaviors that are characteristic of OOD inputs. Rather than relying on proximity to ID samples in any well-defined space, they exploit cues such as predictive uncertainty (e.g., ODIN [16], Energy [17]) or atypical activation patterns (e.g., ReAct [18], GAIA [19]).

Our experiments reveal that each class of methods performs best under different conditions (see Section 3.3). In addition to this taxonomy, we include a detailed review of related work in Appendix A.

**Spectral methods: PCA and Kernel PCA.** We focus on *spectral* OOD detectors—a subset of the regularity-based category—since GradPCA belongs to this class. A canonical example of spectral methods is *kernel PCA*, which operates in two steps:

1. Choose a *feature map*  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  that embeds the data into a suitable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .
2. Perform standard PCA in the space  $\mathcal{H}$ .

The challenge lies in step (1): selecting an appropriate  $h$  such that ID and OOD samples become separable in the induced space. Classical kernel PCA specifies a kernel function rather than an explicit feature map, but this merely shifts the difficulty to kernel design, retaining the full complexity of representation selection. Prior work on kernel PCA for OOD detection has largely relied on generic or ad hoc kernels [13, 20, 21]. In contrast, GradPCA employs the Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK)—a *task- and model-specific* kernel—to define a meaningful feature space. In the next section, we formalise GradPCA and show how it recasts kernel PCA within gradient space.

### 3 GradPCA

The core idea of GradPCA is to apply classical PCA in the space of neural network’s gradients. While conceptually simple, this approach is not directly feasible for modern NNs due to the prohibitive size of the gradient covariance matrix. Consider a NN with output function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and parameters  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^P$ . For a dataset  $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , the empirical covariance matrix of gradients is given by:

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}} := \mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times P}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{F}_{ij} := \nabla_{\mathbf{w}_i} f(x_j). \quad (1)$$

In PCA, the standard approach for handling high-dimensional features is to compute the eigendecomposition of the smaller *dual matrix*  $\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ . However, in modern deep networks, both  $P$  (number of parameters) and  $N$  (dataset size) are typically too large for this to be practical. To address this, GradPCA exploits the inherent low-rank structure of the gradients induced by *NTK alignment*.

#### 3.1 NTK Alignment

A central observation in our approach is that the dual matrix  $\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  introduced above is exactly the empirical Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) evaluated on the dataset:

$$\hat{\Theta} = \mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F}, \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\Theta}_{ij} := \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(x_i), \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(x_j) \rangle. \quad (2)$$

This implies that PCA in gradient space hinges on spectral analysis of the NTK—the kernel that captures correlations between input samples in network’s training dynamics.

A growing line of recent research shows that, during training, the empirical NTK of well-performing neural networks progressively aligns with the structure of the learning task—a phenomenon termed *NTK alignment* [7, 8, 9, 10]. This alignment reshapes the kernel spectrum in a task-relevant manner and is associated with stable training and strong generalization [22, 7, 23]. This echoes classical kernel methods theory, where kernel–target alignment is a known predictor of generalization [24, 25, 26].

In classification problems, NTK alignment manifests as an approximate *block-diagonal structure* in the NTK matrix: inputs from the same class exhibit strong correlations, while cross-class interactions are weak [23]. This behavior is deeply related to the principle of *local elasticity* [27]—where, during training, each input primarily influences inputs belonging to the same class. As a result, gradients concentrate in a low-dimensional subspace *spanned by class-specific directions*, inducing a pronounced low-rank structure. More formally, for a classification problem with  $C$  balanced classes, each containing  $m := N/C$  samples, the NTK takes the following form:

$$\hat{\Theta} = \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m \mathbf{1}_m^\top + \boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad \mathbf{G} := [\mathbf{g}^1, \dots, \mathbf{g}^C], \quad \mathbf{g}^k := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{x_i \in \text{class } k} \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(x_i), \quad (3)$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product. The leading term is rank- $C$  (typically  $C \ll N, P$ ), and  $\xi$  captures deviations from the perfect alignment. When alignment is strong,  $\|\xi\| \leq \epsilon$  for some small  $\epsilon$ , and the NTK spectrum is dominated by the block-structured term. This approximation underpins our method, and we analyze its robustness with respect to the residual term  $\xi$  in Section 4.2.

### 3.2 Algorithm

The final observation underlying GradPCA is that the eigendecomposition of the block-structured matrix  $\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m \mathbf{1}_m^\top$  depends solely on the class-mean gradients  $\mathbf{g}^1, \dots, \mathbf{g}^C$ . As a result, there is no need to store or process the full dataset (or even a large batch) to approximate the principal components of the gradient covariance. It suffices to compute—or approximate—the  $C$  class-mean gradient vectors, which greatly reduces the computational cost. The resulting method reduces to performing PCA on a modestly-sized matrix and is summarized in Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1: GRADPCA

---

**Input** : Test input  $x$ , output function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , ID dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , threshold  $\delta$   
**Output** : Detector decision  $D(x) \in \{0, 1\}$

- 1 **Offline Stage (Training)**
- 2    Compute class-mean gradients  $\mathbf{g}^1, \dots, \mathbf{g}^C$  and global mean  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}$ ;
- 3    Form centered matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{G}} := [\mathbf{g}^1 - \bar{\mathbf{g}}, \dots, \mathbf{g}^C - \bar{\mathbf{g}}]$ ;
- 4    Compute PCs of  $\bar{\Theta} := \bar{\mathbf{G}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times C}$ ;
- 5    Use these to obtain PCs of  $\bar{\mathbf{S}} := \bar{\mathbf{G}} \bar{\mathbf{G}}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times P}$ ;
- 6    Construct projection matrix  $\mathcal{P}$  onto the span of PCs;
- 7 **Online Stage (Inference)**
- 8    Compute centered gradient  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}(x) := \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} f(x) - \bar{\mathbf{g}}$ ;
- 9    Compute score  $s(x) := \|\mathcal{P} \bar{\mathbf{g}}(x)\| / \|\bar{\mathbf{g}}(x)\|$ ;
- 10 **return**  $D(x) := \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta)}(s(x))$

---

An important practical consideration is that our method is formulated for scalar-valued output functions, whereas standard classifiers produce vector-valued outputs in  $\mathbb{R}^C$ . As a result, GradPCA requires an *aggregation* step to combine information across output dimensions. In the default version of our implementation, we use the sum of logits as the scalar output function, which offers a scalable and effective choice. To further reduce computational cost, we compute gradients with respect to only a subset of parameters—particularly useful when the number of classes  $C$  or parameters  $P$  is large. Additional implementation details of GradPCA are provided in Section 5 and Appendix C.

### 3.3 GradPCA Performance: Consistency and Effects of Feature Quality

Before detailing our experimental setup in Section 5, we first highlight key empirical insights.

**Consistency.** A central observation in our experiments is that OOD detection performance can be *highly variable*—even across models with the same architecture and ID dataset—an issue noted in prior work [5, 6]. To address this, our evaluation emphasizes consistency by comparing methods across diverse benchmarks designed to reveal both strengths and weaknesses of each approach. As shown in Figure 1, GradPCA achieves the highest average performance among competitive baselines, ranking within the top three methods in virtually every setting. This demonstrates stability of GradPCA’s performance, in contrast to the high variability observed for many baselines. We attribute this robustness to the principled foundation of our approach: since NTK alignment is pervasive in well-trained networks, and is tied to strong performance [22, 10, 23], GradPCA is expected to generalize well across a broad range of realistic settings.

**Effects of feature quality.** While prior work has shown that OOD detection performance can vary significantly due to subtle factors such as minor architecture details, random seeds, or dataset splits [6], there is little guidance on how to choose or adapt methods accordingly. We advance this discussion by identifying *feature quality* (the strength and generality of learned representations) as a key factor for OOD detection performance, and explaining its role through our categorization of OOD detectors into *regularity-based* and *abnormality-based* (see Section 2).




Figure 1: Performance comparison of OOD detection methods across multiple settings. For each method, the left bar shows the stacked average **AUC scores**  $\uparrow$  on 6 benchmarks described in Section 5 (in order from bottom to top): 1) **CIFAR-10** BiT-M (pretrained, Table 4), 2) **CIFAR-10** TIMM (Table 4), 3) **CIFAR-100** BiT-M (pretrained, Table 1), 4) **CIFAR-100** TIMM (Table 1), 5) **ImageNet** BiT-M (pretrained, Table 2), 6) **ImageNet** BiT-S (Table 2). The middle bar shows the stacked average **FPR95 scores**  $\downarrow$  for each method. The right bar shows the stacked **runtime** per sample estimates (Table 3). The methods are ordered left to right by the average AUC score.

Our perspective offers an intuitive framework for understanding when certain OOD detectors are likely to succeed. Regularity-based methods perform best with strong, general-purpose features (typically from pretrained models), while abnormality-based methods are more effective when models are trained from scratch, likely because general-purpose features suppress the irregularities these methods aim to detect. Our benchmarks (Figure 1) reflect this: for each ID dataset, we include two models with similar architectures and accuracy but differing feature quality—one pretrained on a large general dataset and fine-tuned on the ID dataset, the other trained directly on the ID dataset. One can see that regularity-based methods (GradPCA, KNN [15], Mahalanobis [14]) tend to excel on pretrained models, while abnormality-based methods (GAIA [19], ODIN [16], Energy [17]) are closer to state-of-the-art in the non-pretrained settings. This observation offers practical guidance: regularity-based methods are preferable when strong, pretrained features are available, while abnormality-based methods may be more suitable in lower-quality or non-pretrained regimes.

**Computational cost.** GradPCA achieves competitive inference-time efficiency through its parallelized implementation and support for batch evaluation, performing on par with fast logits-based methods such as MSP and ODIN on CIFAR (see Figure 1). As with other regularity-based methods, it incurs two additional computational costs: higher memory usage (requiring storage of  $O(C)$  vectors) and a training phase. Despite slowing down on ImageNet, GradPCA remains practical on modern hardware, processing over 100 samples per second in our setup (see Appendix D), and provides favorable trade-offs in applications prioritizing robustness and interpretability.

## 4 Spectral OOD Detection for Neural Networks

Spectral methods for OOD detection rely on identifying structure in a feature space via PCA. A central design choice in such methods is the selection of a feature map  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , which embeds input data into a Hilbert space where spectral regularities of ID data can be exploited. In this section, we examine general principles guiding this choice in the context of NNs.

### 4.1 Sufficient Condition for Spectral OOD Detection

We begin with a simple yet broadly applicable result that highlights how the covariance matrix structure can serve as a powerful tool for OOD detection. Specifically, the following theorem (proven in Appendix B.2) shows that points lying partially outside of covariance matrix range are *guaranteed* to be OOD.

**Theorem 4.1** (Sufficient condition for spectral OOD detection). *Let  $X \sim \mu_{\text{id}}$  and  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$  be any function in  $L^2(\mu_{\text{id}})$ . Consider the covariance matrix*

$$\mathbf{S}(h) := \mathbb{E}[h(X)h(X)^\top]. \quad (4)$$

*Let  $\mathcal{P}h(x)$  be the orthogonal projection of  $h(x)$  onto the range of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , if  $\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|_2 < \|h(x)\|_2$  and  $h$  is continuous at  $x$ , then  $x$  is OOD.*

Although this result resembles the elementary linear algebra fact that ranges of  $A$  and  $AA^\top$  are equal, which is used in some classical PCA works [28, 29], our version introduces a probabilistic perspective that, to our knowledge, has not been formally stated in the OOD detection literature. In our view, this provides foundational motivation for the following spectral OOD detector:

$$D_h(x) := \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta)}(s(x)), \quad s(x) := \frac{\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|_2^2}{\|h(x)\|_2^2}, \quad (5)$$

where  $s : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a *score function* and  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  is a threshold. We next show how this connects to the practical use of PCA for OOD detection.

## 4.2 Connection to PCA and GradPCA

PCA performs orthogonal projection onto a subspace spanned by several leading eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  rather than its full range. Due to this, we cannot state a result as sharp as Theorem 4.1. Nevertheless, PCA provides an effective approximation for this result under covariance matrix perturbations.

**Theorem 4.2** (Robustness of PCA). *Consider PCA applied to a matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times P}$  (e.g., estimated from a noisy sample). Let  $h$  and  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  be as in Theorem 4.1, and assume the following:*

$$\|\mathbf{S}(h) - \hat{\mathbf{S}}\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{rank}(\mathbf{S}(h)) = C, \quad (6)$$

*i.e.,  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$  approximates a rank- $C$  covariance matrix  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . Let  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_C$  denote the orthogonal projector onto the top  $C$  eigenvectors of  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ , and let  $\lambda_C$  be the  $C$ -th largest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . Then, for any input  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the following condition is sufficient to guarantee that  $x$  is OOD:*

$$s_{\text{PCA}}(x) < 1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda_C - \epsilon}, \quad s_{\text{PCA}}(x) := \frac{\|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_C h(x)\|_2^2}{\|h(x)\|_2^2}. \quad (7)$$

The proof, based on standard projection bounds and the Davis–Kahan theorem [30], is provided in Appendix B.3. Broadly, this result characterizes the *robustness* of spectral OOD detection to perturbations in the covariance structure—arising from noise, finite-sample effects, or deviations from the ideal low-rank model (e.g., the residual term  $\xi$  in Eq. (3)). This framework naturally aligns with the GradPCA method, where we approximate the empirical (potentially full-rank) gradient covariance using a low-rank surrogate formed from class-mean gradient vectors.

In Appendix B.4, we extend these principles to derive the *sample complexity* of a spectral OOD detector under mild assumptions, assuming  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$  is the empirical covariance matrix.

## 4.3 Necessary Condition for Spectral OOD Detection

The results discussed so far provide only *sufficient*, but *not necessary*, conditions for identifying a point  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  as OOD. Indeed, depending on the choice of  $h$ , Theorem 4.1 may allow to identify all OOD points or, in the worst case, none at all. We illustrate this by the following two examples.

**Example 4.3** (Best case). *Let  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$  be the indicator function of  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  defined as*

$$h(x) = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})}(x) \quad (8)$$

*for some fixed nonzero vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^P$ . Then,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is OOD if and only if  $\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|_2 < \|h(x)\|_2$ , and detector  $D_h$  (defined in Eq. (5)) identifies all OOD points.*

**Example 4.4** (Worst case). *Let  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$  be a function such that:*

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}(h)) = P. \quad (9)$$

*Then  $\mathcal{P}h(x) = h(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and no OOD points can be detected by  $D_h$ .*



As illustrated by the worst-case example, the following condition is necessary for spectral OOD detection to be effective. A formal proof is provided in Appendix B.5.

**Theorem 4.5** (Necessary condition for spectral OOD detection). *Consider the same setting as in Theorem 4.1, and let  $D_h$  be the spectral OOD detector defined in Eq. (5), with an arbitrary threshold  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ . Then, the following condition is necessary for  $D_h$  to be effective (i.e., have non-zero sensitivity):*

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}(h)) < \dim(\{h(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}). \quad (10)$$

In other words, the image of the OOD data must not lie entirely within the image of the ID data. The ideal setting occurs when the feature map  $h$  embeds all ID points into a low-rank subspace while mapping OOD points outside of it—precisely the structure exhibited in the best-case example. In the absence of any knowledge about the distribution or the structure of  $h$ , it is generally intractable to formulate necessary and sufficient conditions for a given point  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to be OOD.

#### 4.4 Choice of Feature Map for Spectral OOD Detection in Neural Networks

Based on the previous discussion, an effective feature map  $h$  for spectral OOD detection should satisfy two key principles consistent with standard PCA and kernel PCA intuition:

1. The image of ID data  $\{h(x) : x \in \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})\}$  should concentrate in a low-rank subspace.
2. The image of OOD data  $\{h(x) : x \notin \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})\}$  should fall outside this subspace.

We now evaluate the following feature spaces commonly used in OOD detection methods against these criteria: *logits*, *hidden activations* (hidden-layer features), and *gradients*.

**Logits:** In classification tasks, the logits are a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^C$ , where  $C$  is the number of classes. Since logits are trained to approximate one-hot vectors of class labels, the image of ID data  $\{h(x) : x \in \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})\}$  spans the whole  $\mathbb{R}^C$ , with no suitable spectral gap. As a result, the logits space lacks the low-rank structure necessary for effective spectral OOD detection. Consistent with this, competitive logits-based OOD detectors (e.g., ODIN [16], Energy [17]) do not rely on spectral structure.

**Hidden activations:** The spectral structure of hidden-layer features depends heavily on the choice of layer. When  $h$  maps to the *penultimate layer* features, the *Neural Collapse* (NC) phenomenon [31] shows that the ID data  $\{h(x) : x \in \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})\}$  indeed often concentrates in a subspace of rank  $C$ , much smaller than the ambient dimension. However, this structure degrades in earlier layers [32]. Several regularity-based OOD detectors (e.g. Mahalanobis [14] or KNN [15]) successfully operate in the activations space, suggesting that it often retains sufficient structure in practice. That said, it remains unclear whether OOD data  $\{h(x) : x \notin \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})\}$  consistently deviates from the ID subspace. In fact, results from the *adversarial examples* literature [33] suggest that OOD inputs can be crafted to effectively mimic ID features in hidden layers, which could limit detection effectiveness.

**Gradients:** As discussed in Section 3, the NTK alignment phenomenon implies that the ID gradients  $\{h(x) : x \in \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})\}$  approximately lie in a low-dimensional subspace of rank  $C$ . Empirically, this low-rank structure is robust across architectures and datasets [8, 7, 10, 23]. Notably, NTK alignment has been observed to happen more often than Neural Collapse [23], and is not limited to the final stage of training [34]. Unlike forward-pass features, gradients belong to a much higher-dimensional space, making the aligned subspace significantly harder to mimic—e.g., through adversarial examples. This high ambient dimensionality amplifies spectral separation, reducing the likelihood that OOD samples project strongly onto the principal components of the ID-induced subspace.

## 5 Experiments

In this section, we outline the technical setup of our experiments. We evaluate performance on three ID datasets: CIFAR-10 (Appendix Table 4), CIFAR-100 (Table 1), and ImageNet-1k (Table 2). Aggregated results across all benchmarks are summarized in Figure 1. To ensure reproducibility and control for variability, we use only *publicly available* OOD datasets and models. Each benchmark includes two such models to assess the impact of representations quality (see Section 3.3).

**Implementation of GradPCA.** Our implementation of GradPCA follows Algorithm 1, with two key extensions: (1) a configurable *aggregation scheme* over output heads, and (2) the option to

compute gradients with respect to a *subset of trainable parameters*, improving scalability. To truncate the spectrum, we use a configurable threshold  $\epsilon$  (default: 0.99), denoting the fraction of the trace retained by the principal components. The default variant, referred to as **GradPCA**, operates on gradients with respect to the last hidden layer parameters, averages logits across output dimensions before PCA application, and computes gradient class-means sequentially over the training data—making it scalable to large datasets. Computational costs are described in Appendix D.

In addition, we implement several *variants* of GradPCA: (1) **GradPCA+DICE**, which incorporates the DICE method [35] by sparsifying gradient class-means before PCA; (2) **GradPCA-Batch**, which computes the empirical NTK on a batch instead of relying on class-means; (3) **GradPCA-Vec**, which omits output aggregation and computes GradPCA separately for each of the  $C$  output heads, producing  $C$  scores that can be aggregated post hoc. While these variants can be advantageous in specific scenarios, our main evaluation (Figure 1) focuses on the base GradPCA variant due to its versatility, efficiency, and *lack of hyperparameter tuning*—enabling fair comparison across models and datasets. We include several GradPCA variants in Tables 1 and 2, and extensive ablations in Appendix E. We release the implementation of GradPCA in JAX [36] with this paper.

**Baselines.** We compare GradPCA against a range of established OOD detection methods, including: Maximum Logit Score (naive baseline), Maximum Softmax Probability (MSP) [37], ODIN [16], Energy-based Score [17], DICE [35], Mahalanobis [14], Deep  $k$ -Nearest Neighbors (KNN)[15], ReAct [18], GAIA [19], and GradOrth [38]. Most baselines are implemented using the PyTorch-based Detectors library [39], with the exception of the gradient-based methods GAIA and GradOrth. Additional implementation details are provided in Appendix C.

## 5.1 CIFAR Benchmark

**Datasets:** For CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, we use the standard training splits during the training phase and the corresponding test splits as ID data during the detection phase. We evaluate against a range of commonly used OOD datasets: SVHN [40], Places [41], LSUN [42], iSUN [43], and Textures [44]. SVHN (test split), Places (validation), and Textures (full dataset) are taken directly from the predefined splits in the TensorFlow Datasets collection [45]. For LSUN and iSUN, we rely on curated subsets for OOD detection benchmarks introduced in the ODIN paper [16], including LSUN (crop) OOD, LSUN (resize) OOD, and iSUN OOD.

**Models:** We consider two publicly available trained models: (1) ResNetV2-50 from Big Transfer (BiT) repository [46] pretrained on ImageNet-21k (BiT-M) and fine-tuned on CIFAR, (2) ResNet-34 trained directly on CIFAR provided in the PyTorch Image Models (TIMM) package [47].

**Results:** As shown in Table 1, GradPCA achieves top performance on the CIFAR-100 model with general-purpose (pretrained) features. In this setting, the strongest competing method is DICE, followed by the regularity-based KNN and Mahalanobis. As discussed in Section 3.3, the landscape changes in the task-specific (non-pretrained) case: here, the abnormality-based GAIA excels, and confidence-based scores (e.g. ODIN, MSP) approach SOTA. Notably, GradPCA remains competitive—ranking second—demonstrating its adaptability across both regimes. An additional observation,

	Methods	SVHN		Places		LSUN-c		LSUN-r		iSUN		Textures		Average	
		FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑
ResNetV2-50 (BiT-M)	Max logits	65.17	87.17	59.08	84.43	68.8	84.11	67.41	81.34	68.5	80.76	54.79	87.44	63.96	84.21
	MSP	68.42	85.87	67.05	81.2	72.56	82.93	70.21	79.95	71.32	79.47	64.33	83.35	68.98	82.13
	ODIN	65.18	87.17	59.11	84.43	68.86	84.11	67.43	81.34	68.51	80.76	54.79	87.44	63.98	84.21
	Energy	63.74	87.44	47.17	87.05	65.29	84.41	67.19	81.92	66.94	81.39	40.15	90.83	58.41	85.51
	DICE	<b>13.92</b>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>30.01</b>	<b>93.07</b>	<b>9.29</b>	<b>97.91</b>	<b>59.06</b>	<b>85.47</b>	<b>55.54</b>	<b>85.75</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>99.5</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>93.2</b>
	Mahalanobis	38.07	93.74	27.26	94.0	27.12	95.81	81.08	82.04	82.31	78.8	6.41	99.88	42.71	90.71
	KNN	<b>14.01</b> <sub>±0.22</sub>	<b>96.80</b> <sub>±0.07</sub>	42.31 <sub>±1.19</sub>	88.51 <sub>±0.12</sub>	13.09 <sub>±0.75</sub>	97.55 <sub>±0.08</sub>	59.95 <sub>±1.20</sub>	<b>87.32</b> <sub>±0.48</sub>	63.82 <sub>±1.15</sub>	83.81 <sub>±0.71</sub>	3.46 <sub>±0.32</sub>	99.17 <sub>±0.05</sub>	32.77 <sub>±0.81</sub>	92.19 <sub>±0.25</sub>
	ReAct	44.77	89.03	69.72	76.87	52.67	85.66	86.61	71.04	87.91	67.77	11.54	97.36	58.87	81.29
	GAIA-A	52.74	89.12	68.06	79.66	67.25	83.95	82.79	76.53	85.82	73.55	62.11	85.13	69.8	81.32
	GAIA-Z	79.76	81.78	98.01	46.36	65.26	78.59	99.63	37.74	97.32	46.73	32.19	92.62	78.69	63.97
	GradOrth	96.55 <sub>±1.77</sub>	63.74 <sub>±0.44</sub>	95.36 <sub>±1.37</sub>	57.22 <sub>±0.39</sub>	97.2 <sub>±1.26</sub>	60.58 <sub>±1.73</sub>	96.01 <sub>±2.76</sub>	60.45 <sub>±0.41</sub>	96.37 <sub>±1.73</sub>	58.74 <sub>±0.57</sub>	79.38 <sub>±1.06</sub>	90.52 <sub>±1.01</sub>	93.48 <sub>±1.16</sub>	63.74 <sub>±0.33</sub>
	<b>GradPCA</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>96.58</b>	<b>29.64</b>	<b>93.56</b>	<b>8.28</b>	<b>98.42</b>	<b>51.75</b>	<b>88.93</b>	<b>56.93</b>	<b>87.34</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>99.24</b>	<b>27.87</b>	<b>94.01</b>
	<b>GradPCA+DICE</b>	18.11	96.57	30.77	<b>93.34</b>	<b>8.12</b>	<b>98.46</b>	55.72	<b>87.43</b>	<b>59.53</b>	<b>86.27</b>	3.59	99.2	29.31	<b>93.54</b>
ResNet-34 (TIMM)	Max logits	71.38	83.83	69.98	83.47	64.04	85.0	75.26	79.34	62.14	86.2	66.08	84.45	68.15	83.72
	MSP	71.47	83.4	68.21	83.6	74.64	79.78	68.92	83.35	71.69	81.83	75.44	80.66	71.73	82.1
	ODIN	71.38	83.83	64.04	85.0	75.26	79.34	62.14	86.2	66.08	84.45	69.98	83.47	68.15	83.71
	Energy	73.15	83.79	<b>61.66</b>	85.5	77.32	79.18	<b>56.32</b>	<b>87.24</b>	<b>61.57</b>	<b>85.38</b>	<b>65.7</b>	84.44	<b>65.95</b>	84.26
	DICE	83.35	81.41	67.55	84.0	88.91	75.29	<b>58.77</b>	<b>86.82</b>	<b>64.4</b>	84.78	<b>64.7</b>	84.53	71.28	82.8
	Mahalanobis	64.76	87.75	72.3	84.83	<b>63.01</b>	86.09	80.09	81.99	79.99	81.33	78.75	80.31	73.15	83.72
	KNN	64.73 <sub>±0.25</sub>	87.26 <sub>±0.07</sub>	67.77 <sub>±0.13</sub>	85.20 <sub>±0.01</sub>	67.76 <sub>±0.11</sub>	84.55 <sub>±0.05</sub>	70.51 <sub>±0.24</sub>	83.46 <sub>±0.05</sub>	72.46 <sub>±0.14</sub>	82.33 <sub>±0.02</sub>	74.74 <sub>±0.21</sub>	80.54 <sub>±0.11</sub>	69.66 <sub>±0.20</sub>	83.89 <sub>±0.05</sub>
	ReAct	100.0	17.69	99.94	20.66	99.37	18.59	100.0	21.24	100.0	21.66	99.79	25.87	99.85	20.95
	GAIA-A	<b>49.73</b>	<b>92.52</b>	64.28	<b>86.0</b>	<b>61.22</b>	<b>89.39</b>	63.86	84.69	67.3	83.32	69.07	78.94	<b>62.58</b>	85.81
	GAIA-Z	<b>13.33</b>	<b>97.34</b>	85.66	76.45	<b>28.51</b>	<b>94.66</b>	88.11	80.87	78.5	<b>84.94</b>	<b>13.44</b>	<b>97.34</b>	<b>51.26</b>	<b>88.6</b>
	GradOrth	90.19 <sub>±0.69</sub>	64.92 <sub>±1.57</sub>	85.62 <sub>±1.75</sub>	67.94 <sub>±1.14</sub>	90.87 <sub>±2.44</sub>	63.10 <sub>±0.80</sub>	75.08 <sub>±0.75</sub>	79.02 <sub>±1.12</sub>	77.47 <sub>±2.24</sub>	76.63 <sub>±1.06</sub>	82.67 <sub>±1.70</sub>	71.43 <sub>±1.99</sub>	83.65 <sub>±1.02</sub>	70.51 <sub>±1.65</sub>
	<b>GradPCA</b>	61.22	89.1	62.71	<b>87.31</b>	63.45	87.11	73.97	84.25	73.01	83.85	72.3	84.63	67.78	<b>86.84</b>
	<b>GradPCA+DICE</b>	<b>61.21</b>	89.1	<b>61.27</b>	<b>87.84</b>	64.81	86.62	70.59	<b>86.4</b>	69.95	<b>85.79</b>	70.24	<b>86.1</b>	66.34	<b>86.98</b>

Table 1: **CIFAR-100**. The methods achieving the top-3 performance metrics are highlighted in bold, with the best-performing method shown in orange, the second in green, and the third in blue.



also visible in Figure 1, is that methods that excel under certain conditions may fail entirely in others due to violations of their core assumptions. Examples in this benchmark include ReAct and GAIA-Z.

## 5.2 ImageNet Benchmark

Methods	Places		SUN		iNaturalist		Textures		Average		
	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	
Max login	89.36	59.98	87.94	61.09	55.73	84.78	94.85	58.66	81.97	66.28	73.73
MSP	92.84	57.05	92.97	56.72	71.28	76.5	95.44	56.71	88.13	61.74	84.4
ODIN	89.37	59.98	87.95	61.68	55.74	84.78	94.85	58.66	81.98	66.28	73.86
Energy	86.84	60.96	83.98	63.36	46.07	87.17	94.26	58.91	77.8	67.6	70.79
DICE	88.34	65.87	81.67	71.39	71.53	87.4	96.0	57.65	84.38	70.58	86.55
Mahalanobis	91.82±0.04	56.75±0.04	92.03±0.07	57.58±0.10	53.81±0.11	92.07±0.09	91.06±0.12	57.40±0.09	81.97±0.11	74.72±0.07	97.70±0.16
KNN	90.33±0.05	56.29±0.10	92.14±0.09	57.22±0.08	37.95±0.10	90.85±0.04	47.49±0.08	89.78±0.10	67.15±0.10	72.97±0.07	92.68±0.11
ReAct	92.86±0.09	53.85±0.06	91.21±0.05	55.73±0.04	62.24±0.19	83.02±0.04	96.44±0.01	52.85±0.04	85.68±0.11	61.36±0.01	69.42±0.04
GAIA-Z	95.77	47.23	94.65	51.41	85.31	60.07	98.95	30.96	93.67	47.42	53.64
GAIA-Z	97.81	56.09	98.77	57.51	79.55	79.15	62.39	82.08	84.63	68.71	94.77
GradPCA	98.19±0.07	35.27±0.09	98.79±0.14	34.57±0.11	98.43±0.11	53.64±0.17	97.75±0.07	66.27±0.12	96.79±0.12	47.44±0.11	97.46±0.02
GradPCA	83.12	71.55	75.16	78.68	45.84	91.69	60.74	86.49	66.22	82.1	61.27
GradPCA+DICE	76.97	75.51	64.62	82.95	37.68	93.1	44.87	90.4	55.58	85.49	65.07

Table 2: **ImageNet**. The methods achieving the top-3 performance metrics are highlighted in bold, with the best-performing method shown in **orange**, the second in **green**, and the third in **blue**.

**Datasets:** We use the full ImageNet-1k training split in the training phase. While a subset could be used, our method is scalable enough to handle the entire dataset efficiently. For the detection phase, we treat ImageNetV2 [48] as the ID dataset. As OOD datasets, we use curated subsets of Places [41], SUN [49], and iNaturalist [50], released by the MOS paper [51] to ensure minimal category overlap with ImageNet. This control is especially important given that these datasets contain many overlapping classes. We additionally include the full Textures dataset [44] as an OOD source.

**Models:** We consider two BiT models [46]: (1) ResNetV2-101 pretrained on ImageNet-21k (BiT-M) and fine-tuned on ImageNet-1k, (2) ResNetV2-50 trained only on ImageNet-1k (BiT-S).

**Results:** Consistent with trends observed on the CIFAR benchmark, GradPCA achieves competitive performance on ImageNet—ranking first in the pretrained setting (followed by regularity-based Mahalanobis and KNN) and second in the non-pretrained setting, where DICE leads. As in the CIFAR case, the ranking of methods varies substantially between the two models. Notably, the pretrained ImageNet benchmark is substantially more challenging than the non-pretrained one for all detectors, despite the use of models with similar architecture and accuracy. This highlights the sensitivity of OOD detection to subtle differences in evaluation setup. We also report results for GradPCA+DICE (with  $p = 0.8$ ) in Tables 2 and 1, along with ablations for this and other GradPCA variants in Appendix E. While certain tuned variants yield modest improvements in specific cases, their performance varies across settings; thus, we focus on the default GradPCA in our discussion.

## 6 Conclusions and Broad Impact

This paper introduces GradPCA, an OOD detection method based on the low-rank structure of gradients in well-trained NNs, induced by NTK alignment. Our approach bridges recent advances in OOD detection with classical PCA-based intuition, clarifying when spectral methods are applicable in modern deep learning. In addition, our theoretical analysis and the observation about feature quality as a critical factor for OOD detectors’ performance offer practical guidance for selecting appropriate detectors based on the training regime. Such guidance remains rare in the OOD detection literature. Finally, our work establishes a novel connection between the NTK—a common topic in deep learning theory—and OOD detection, a largely empirical field with limited theoretical grounding.

**Limitations.** GradPCA is built on the assumption that the NTK structure effectively separates ID and OOD points in gradient space. While this may not hold universally, the assumption is both explicit and empirically testable—unlike many heuristic or implicit assumptions used in prior works. A second limitation is memory scalability with respect to the number of classes: GradPCA stores up to  $O(C)$  gradient vectors, which can be costly for large  $C$ . This requirement is common to many regularity-based approaches and can potentially be mitigated through parameter subset selection.

**Future Work.** By establishing a connection between NTK alignment and OOD detection, our work enables future advances in NTK theory to directly inform and improve methods like GradPCA. As the study of feature learning dynamics and NTK structure in neural networks remains an active area of theoretical research, we anticipate that many forthcoming insights in this domain could be leveraged to design more principled and effective OOD detectors. On the practical side, future work could address scalability of GradPCA by aggregating classes or improving the implementation efficiency.

## References

- [1] Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- [2] Alexey Kurakin, Ian J. Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio. Adversarial examples in the physical world. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Workshop Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [3] Anh Mai Nguyen, Jason Yosinski, and Jeff Clune. Deep neural networks are easily fooled: High confidence predictions for unrecognizable images. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2015, Boston, MA, USA, June 7-12, 2015*, pages 427–436. IEEE Computer Society, 2015.
- [4] Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul F. Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. Concrete problems in AI safety. *CoRR*, abs/1606.06565, 2016.
- [5] Fahim Tajwar, Ananya Kumar, Sang Michael Xie, and Percy Liang. No true state-of-the-art? ood detection methods are inconsistent across datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05554*, 2021.
- [6] Kamil Szyk, Tomasz Walkowiak, and Henryk Maciejewski. Why out-of-distribution detection experiments are not reliable-subtle experimental details muddle the ood detector rankings. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2078–2088. PMLR, 2023.
- [7] Alexander Atanasov, Blake Bordelon, and Cengiz Pehlevan. Neural networks as kernel learners: The silent alignment effect. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [8] Aristide Baratin, Thomas George, César Laurent, R. Devon Hjelm, Guillaume Lajoie, Pascal Vincent, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Implicit regularization via neural feature alignment. In *The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2021, April 13-15, 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 130 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2269–2277. PMLR, 2021.
- [9] Mariia Selezneva and Gitta Kutyniok. Neural tangent kernel beyond the infinite-width limit: Effects of depth and initialization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 19522–19560. PMLR, 2022.
- [10] Haozhe Shan and Blake Bordelon. A theory of neural tangent kernel alignment and its influence on training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14301*, 2021.
- [11] K. Pearson. Liii. on lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin philosophical magazine and journal of science*, 2(11):559–572, 1901.
- [12] Harold Hotelling. Analysis of a complex of statistical variables into principal components. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 24(6):417–441, 1933.
- [13] Kun Fang, Qinghua Tao, Kexin Lv, Mingzhen He, Xiaolin Huang, and JIE YANG. Kernel PCA for Out-of-Distribution Detection. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [14] Kimin Lee, Kibok Lee, Honglak Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. A simple unified framework for detecting out-of-distribution samples and adversarial attacks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [15] Yiyu Sun, Yifei Ming, Xiaojin Zhu, and Yixuan Li. Out-of-distribution detection with deep nearest neighbors. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20827–20840. PMLR, 2022.
- [16] Shiyu Liang, Yixuan Li, and R. Srikant. Enhancing the reliability of out-of-distribution image detection in neural networks. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2018.
- [17] Weitang Liu, Xiaoyun Wang, John Owens, and Yixuan Li. Energy-based out-of-distribution detection. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:21464–21475, 2020.
- [18] Yiyu Sun, Chuan Guo, and Yixuan Li. React: Out-of-distribution detection with rectified activations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:144–157, 2021.

- [19] Jinggang Chen, Junjie Li, Xiaoyang Qu, Jianzong Wang, Jiguang Wan, and Jing Xiao. Gaia: Delving into gradient-based attribution abnormality for out-of-distribution detection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:79946–79958, 2023.
- [20] Heiko Hoffmann. Kernel pca for novelty detection. *Pattern Recognition*, 40(3):863–874, 2007.
- [21] Yingchao Xiao, Huangang Wang, Wenli Xu, and Junwu Zhou. L1 norm based kpca for novelty detection. *Pattern Recognition*, 46(1):389–396, 2013.
- [22] Shuxiao Chen, Hangfeng He, and Weijie Su. Label-aware neural tangent kernel: Toward better generalization and local elasticity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15847–15858, 2020.
- [23] Mariia Seleznova, Dana Weitzner, Raja Giryes, Gitta Kutyniok, and Hung-Hsu Chou. Neural (tangent kernel) collapse. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 16240–16270. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023.
- [24] Nello Cristianini, John Shawe-Taylor, Andre Elisseeff, and Jaz Kandola. On kernel-target alignment. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 14, 2001.
- [25] Mehmet Gönen and Ethem Alpaydin. Multiple kernel learning algorithms. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2211–2268, 2011.
- [26] Abdulkadir Canatar, Blake Bordelon, and Cengiz Pehlevan. Spectral bias and task-model alignment explain generalization in kernel regression and infinitely wide neural networks. *Nature communications*, 12(1):2914, 2021.
- [27] Hangfeng He and Weijie J. Su. The local elasticity of neural networks. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [28] Bernhard Schölkopf, Alexander Smola, and Klaus-Robert Müller. Nonlinear component analysis as a kernel eigenvalue problem. In *Neural Computation*, volume 10, pages 1299–1319, 1998.
- [29] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, Jerome H Friedman, and Jerome H Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, volume 2. Springer, 2009.
- [30] Chandler Davis and W. M. Kahan. The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. iii. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 7(1):1–46, 1970.
- [31] Vardan Papayan, XY Han, and David L Donoho. Prevalence of neural collapse during the terminal phase of deep learning training. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(40):24652–24663, 2020.
- [32] Liam Parker, Emre Onal, Anton Stengel, and Jake Intrater. Neural collapse in the intermediate hidden layers of classification neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02760*, 2023.
- [33] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Adversarial examples are not easily detected: Bypassing ten detection methods. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, pages 3–14, 2017.
- [34] Stanislav Fort, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, Mansheej Paul, Sepideh Kharaghani, Daniel M Roy, and Surya Ganguli. Deep learning versus kernel learning: an empirical study of loss landscape geometry and the time evolution of the neural tangent kernel. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:5850–5861, 2020.
- [35] Yiyu Sun and Yixuan Li. Dice: Leveraging sparsification for out-of-distribution detection. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 691–708. Springer, 2022.
- [36] James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Nectula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018.
- [37] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. A Baseline for Detecting Misclassified and Out-of-Distribution Examples in Neural Networks. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2017.
- [38] Sima Behpour, Thang Long Doan, Xin Li, Wenbin He, Liang Gou, and Liu Ren. Gradorth: A simple yet efficient out-of-distribution detection with orthogonal projection of gradients. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:38206–38230, 2023.

- [39] Eduardo Dadalto. Detectors: a python library for generalized out-of-distribution detection, 5 2023.
- [40] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bissacco, Baolin Wu, Andrew Y Ng, et al. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. In *NIPS workshop on deep learning and unsupervised feature learning*, page 4. Granada, 2011.
- [41] Bolei Zhou, Agata Lapedriza, Aditya Khosla, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Places: A 10 million image database for scene recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(6):1452–1464, 2017.
- [42] Fisher Yu, Ari Seff, Yinda Zhang, Shuran Song, Thomas Funkhouser, and Jianxiong Xiao. Lsun: Construction of a large-scale image dataset using deep learning with humans in the loop. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.03365*, 2015.
- [43] Pingmei Xu, Krista A Ehinger, Yinda Zhang, Adam Finkelstein, Sanjeev R Kulkarni, and Jianxiong Xiao. Turkergaze: Crowdsourcing saliency with webcam based eye tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.06755*, 2015.
- [44] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhransu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3606–3613, 2014.
- [45] TensorFlow Datasets, a collection of ready-to-use datasets. <https://www.tensorflow.org/datasets>.
- [46] Lucas Beyer, Xiaohua Zhai, Amélie Royer, Larisa Markeeva, Rohan Anil, and Alexander Kolesnikov. Knowledge distillation: A good teacher is patient and consistent. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10925–10934, 2022.
- [47] Ross Wightman. Pytorch image models. <https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models>, 2019.
- [48] Benjamin Recht, Rebecca Roelofs, Ludwig Schmidt, and Vaishal Shankar. Do imagenet classifiers generalize to imagenet? In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5389–5400. PMLR, 2019.
- [49] Jianxiong Xiao, James Hays, Krista A Ehinger, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Sun database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. In *2010 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3485–3492. IEEE, 2010.
- [50] Grant Van Horn, Oisin Mac Aodha, Yang Song, Yin Cui, Chen Sun, Alex Shepard, Hartwig Adam, Pietro Perona, and Serge Belongie. The inaturalist species classification and detection dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8769–8778, 2018.
- [51] Rui Huang and Yixuan Li. Mos: Towards scaling out-of-distribution detection for large semantic space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021.
- [52] Huy Tran. Ood machine learning: Detection, robustness, and generalization. <https://github.com/huytransformer/Awesome-Out-Of-Distribution-Detection>, 2023. Accessed: 2025-03-30.
- [53] Jingkan Yang, Kaiyang Zhou, Yixuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Generalized out-of-distribution detection: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11334*, 2021.
- [54] Mohammadreza Salehi, Hossein Mirzaei, Dan Hendrycks, Yixuan Li, Mohammad Hossein Rohban, and Mohammad Sabokrou. A unified survey on anomaly, novelty, open-set, and out-of-distribution detection: Solutions and future challenges. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- [55] Joost van Amersfoort, Lewis Smith, Yee Whye Teh, and Yarin Gal. Uncertainty estimation using a single deep deterministic neural network. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9690–9700. PMLR, 2020.
- [56] Xuefeng Du, Zhaoning Wang, Mu Cai, and Yixuan Li. VOS: learning what you don’t know by virtual outlier synthesis. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [57] Chandramouli Shama Sastry and Sageev Oore. Detecting out-of-distribution examples with gram matrices. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8491–8501. PMLR, 2020.

- [58] Jie Ren, Peter J. Liu, Emily Fertig, Jasper Snoek, Ryan Poplin, Mark A. DePristo, Joshua V. Dillon, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Likelihood ratios for out-of-distribution detection. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 14680–14691, 2019.
- [59] Xiaoyuan Guan, Zhouwu Liu, Wei-Shi Zheng, Yuren Zhou, and Ruixuan Wang. Revisit pca-based technique for out-of-distribution detection. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2023, Paris, France, October 1-6, 2023*, pages 19374–19382. IEEE, 2023.
- [60] Yixia Li, Boya Xiong, Guanhua Chen, and Yun Chen. Setar: Out-of-distribution detection with selective low-rank approximation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:72840–72871, 2024.
- [61] Yingwen Wu, Ruiji Yu, Xinwen Cheng, Zhengbao He, and Xiaolin Huang. Pursuing feature separation based on neural collapse for out-of-distribution detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17816*, 2024.
- [62] Yingwen Wu, Tao Li, Xinwen Cheng, Jie Yang, and Xiaolin Huang. Low-dimensional gradient helps out-of-distribution detection. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [63] Zihan Zhang and Xiang Xiang. Decoupling maxlogit for out-of-distribution detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3388–3397, 2023.
- [64] Jinsol Lee and Ghassan AlRegib. Gradients as a measure of uncertainty in neural networks. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 2416–2420. IEEE, 2020.
- [65] Rui Huang, Andrew Geng, and Yixuan Li. On the importance of gradients for detecting distributional shifts in the wild. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 677–689, 2021.
- [66] Gukyeon Kwon, Mohit Prabhushankar, Dogancan Temel, and Ghassan AlRegib. Backpropagated gradient representations for anomaly detection. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2020.
- [67] Sina Sharifi, Taha Entesari, Bardia Safaei, Vishal M Patel, and Mahyar Fazlyab. Gradient-regularized out-of-distribution detection. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 459–478. Springer, 2024.
- [68] Arthur Jacot, Clément Hongler, and Franck Gabriel. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, pages 8580–8589, 2018.
- [69] G. W. Stewart and Ji-Guang Sun. *Matrix Perturbation Theory*. Academic Press, Boston, 1990.
- [70] Yi Yu, Tengyao Wang, and Richard J Samworth. A useful variant of the davis–kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika*, 102(2):315–323, 2015.
- [71] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Sampling from large matrices: An approach through geometric functional analysis. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 54(4):21–es, 2007.
- [72] Jonathan Heek, Anselm Levskaya, Avital Oliver, Marvin Ritter, Bertrand Rondepierre, Andreas Steiner, and Marc van Zee. Flax: A neural network library and ecosystem for JAX, 2024.
- [73] Alexander Kolesnikov, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohua Zhai, Joan Puigcerver, Jessica Yung, Sylvain Gelly, and Neil Houlsby. Big transfer (bit): General visual representation learning. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part V 16*, pages 491–507. Springer, 2020.



# Supplementary Material

This supplementary document is organized as follows:

- **Section A** provides a detailed discussion of related work, expanding on the brief overview given in the main paper.
- **Section B** presents additional theoretical results and complete proofs of the main propositions and theorems introduced in the paper.
- **Section C** describes the implementation details of GradPCA algorithm and the baseline methods used in our experiments.
- **Section D** discusses the computational cost considerations, including a breakdown of the components involved, empirical runtime comparisons, and an estimate of total compute usage.
- **Section E** reports additional experimental results, including CIFAR-10 benchmark and a set of ablation studies for GradPCA variants.

## A Related Works

The field of out-of-distribution detection has witnessed rapid growth in recent years, with over 15,000 publications since 2021 referencing either “*OOD detection*” and “*out-of-distribution detection*”. This surge in research activity has made it increasingly challenging to maintain a comprehensive view of methodological advances and theoretical developments. Still, this section complements the overview provided in Section 2 by offering a broader survey of related work. We organize existing OOD detection methods according to our proposed taxonomy of *regularity-based* and *abnormality-based* approaches, which provides a unified lens for understanding a wide range of techniques in the literature.

### A.1 Surveys and Background on OOD Detection

Out-of-distribution detection has become a central topic in machine learning, particularly in the context of safety and robustness. For a broad overview of the field, Huy et al.[52] maintain an extensive and regularly updated repository of OOD detection research. The foundational work by Hendrycks and Gimpel[37] introduced one of the first widely adopted baselines for OOD detection. More recent surveys, such as those by Yang et al.[53] and Salehi et al.[54], provide systematic categorizations of the growing variety of techniques developed in this rapidly evolving area.

### A.2 Regularity-Based OOD Detection

Many OOD detection methods rely on the structured nature of in-distribution (ID) data in a given feature space. These *regularity-based* methods model the geometry or statistics of ID samples—using representations, decision boundaries, or statistical criteria—to flag inputs that deviate from this structure. Due to the nature of this class, regularity-based methods usually require a *training stage* to learn the properties of the ID data. While Section 2 provides a unified overview, here we expand on specific approaches.

**Proximity-based approaches.** A wide range of methods rely on the distance of test points to a certain learned regular region in the feature space. The Mahalanobis detector [14] fits class-conditional Gaussians and scores inputs by their distance to the closest class mean. KNN-based detectors [15] operate in the penultimate-layer space, identifying OOD inputs by their distance to nearest neighbors on the ID feature manifold.

*Prototype-based detectors* [55, 56] compute per-class feature centers—prototype vectors, similar to the class means used in GradPCA or Mahalanobis—and measure similarity between a test input and the nearest prototype. Since these methods often include additional regularization (e.g., energy shaping or uncertainty constraints) to improve ID–OOD separation, they can be viewed as hybrids that combine regularity-based modeling with abnormality-oriented scoring techniques.

Gram-matrix consistency [57] and likelihood-ratio scoring [58] offer alternative strategies for exploiting structural regularities in ID data. In particular, the relationship between the activation Gram matrix and OOD detection explored in [57] resonates with our theoretical discussion about the covariance matrix, which provides principled guarantees for spectral detection.

**Spectral approaches.** Spectral methods constitute a key class of regularity-based OOD detectors. A canonical example is kernel PCA, introduced by Schölkopf et al. [28] and later applied to novelty detection by Hoffmann [20], who measured novelty via the squared distance to a learned principal subspace in feature space.

More recently, Guan et al. [59] revisited PCA-based OOD detection, identifying the limitations of conventional PCA and proposing a regularized reconstruction error, further enhanced by combining it with energy-based scoring. Building on this and [15], Fang et al. [13] introduced a kernel PCA detector using generic nonlinear kernels (e.g., RBF, polynomial) to improve separation between ID and OOD inputs within the principal component subspace.

Other recent methods apply spectral principles in novel, non-covariance-based ways. Li et al. [60] proposed SeTAR, a training-free, post-hoc detector that applies spectral analysis directly to pretrained model weights, arguing that the low-rank directions preserve ID-relevant structure while suppressing OOD-sensitive responses. Wu et al. [61] took a complementary approach, enforcing neural collapse during training to align ID features with a principal subspace and constrain OOD features to lie in the orthogonal complement. This hybrid method combines regularity modeling with supervised feature separation.

**Gradient-based approaches.** While the majority of gradient-based OOD detectors align more closely with the abnormality-based category, a few recent methods employ spectral regularity explicitly in the gradient space. In particular, GradOrth [38] operates in loss-gradient space and applies SVD to last-layer activations to estimate principal directions and transfer them to the gradient space. In contrast, Wu et al. [62] project input gradients onto class-mean directions, avoiding SVD altogether for efficiency.

Although these methods bear superficial similarity to GradPCA in that they use spectral reasoning and gradient space representations, they lack the theoretical grounding of our approach. In GradOrth, it is unclear why the SVD of activation covariances should align with meaningful directions in the gradient space—there is no formal justification for this connection. In contrast, GradPCA performs SVD on the empirical NTK, which is the true dual of the gradient covariance matrix and thus guaranteed to share its spectrum. Moreover, GradOrth’s reliance on large batches to estimate this structure limits its scalability to settings with many classes.

The approach of Wu et al. [62], while more scalable, makes a strong assumption that class-mean gradients themselves represent principal directions. However, these means are generally neither orthogonal nor aligned with the dominant eigenvectors of the gradient covariance. GradPCA addresses this by using class means as a compressed basis to approximate the NTK’s leading eigenspace, rather than assuming they are eigenvectors themselves.

### A.3 Abnormality-Based OOD Detection

A complementary line of research focuses on detecting OOD inputs by monitoring deviations in model behavior, rather than modeling the structure of ID data. As discussed in Section 2, we refer to these as abnormality-based methods. They evaluate model responses to unfamiliar inputs by tracking indicators such as uncertainty, confidence degradation, or anomalous activation patterns. Unlike regularity-based approaches, which characterize the ID data structure in a well-defined feature space, these methods rely on behavioral cues that arise when the model encounters OOD samples—giving rise to a broad range of detection strategies.

**Confidence-based approaches.** Many abnormality-based OOD detection methods define scoring functions on the model’s output logits to estimate prediction confidence. These scores—such as softmax maximum, energy, or temperature-scaled outputs—do not correspond to distances in any well-defined feature space, as they lack a reference point or metric structure. Moreover, these methods are post-hoc: they do not estimate or rely on the structure of ID data, but rather assume that OOD

samples induce abnormal confidence patterns. For these reasons, confidence-based methods are best categorized as abnormality-based.

A foundational method is Maximum Softmax Probability (MSP)[37], which uses the model’s top predicted class probability as an OOD score. ODIN[16] improves upon MSP by applying temperature scaling and gradient-based input perturbations to enhance confidence separation between ID and OOD samples. Energy-based detection [17] generalizes these ideas by scoring inputs based on the log-sum-exp of logits.

Several methods further refine confidence signals. ReAct [18] clips abnormally high activations in the penultimate layer to reduce overconfidence of OOD inputs, aiming to improve the scores like MSP or ODIN. DML [63] decouples the max-logit score into cosine similarity and norm components, learning a weighted combination to better separate ID and OOD examples. Finally, DICE [35] identifies a sparse, high-confidence subnetwork by pruning low-magnitude weights, aiming to sharpen the model’s output distribution and improve OOD discrimination.

**Gradient-based approaches.** A growing number of abnormality-based methods leverage gradient information to detect OOD samples by assuming that such inputs trigger distinct or unstable model responses. These approaches do not model in-distribution structure explicitly but instead define OOD based on deviations in gradient norms, patterns, or attribution behavior.

Lee et al.[64] introduced the *feature-extraction hypothesis*, proposing that the norm of the loss gradient can indicate how well the model understands a given input. They showed that OOD or corrupted samples often yield larger or more erratic gradients, making gradient magnitude a useful proxy for abnormality. GradNorm[65] builds on this idea by computing the  $\ell_1$ -norm of gradients from the KL divergence between the model output and a uniform distribution, observing that ID inputs typically produce stronger gradient signals. Kwon et al. [66] proposed a Fisher score for anomaly detection in autoencoders, interpreting reconstruction gradients as features and arguing that anomalous inputs require more complex updates.

Other methods analyze gradient-derived attribution maps. In particular, GAIA [19] detects OOD inputs by analyzing disruptions in gradient-based attribution maps such as saliency and integrated gradients. These are *input gradients*—computed with respect to the input, not model parameters as in GradPCA. GAIA method is post-hoc and model-agnostic, relying on irregularities in explanation behavior rather than ID modeling.

Some approaches incorporate gradient behavior during training. Sharifi et al. [67] introduce a regularization scheme to enforce locally consistent OOD scores, combining it with an energy-based sampling strategy to expose the model to diverse outlier patterns.

#### A.4 Neural Tangent Kernel Alignment

GradPCA is inspired by insights from the Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) framework, originally introduced by Jacot et al.[68]. While classical NTK theory considers the infinite-width limit where the kernel remains fixed during training, recent work has shifted toward studying the empirical NTK and its dynamic alignment to the target function—termed *NTK alignment* [8, 10, 7].

NTK alignment has been linked to improved generalization [22] and builds on earlier work in kernel methods, where alignment between kernel and target label structures was formally studied [24, 25]. Empirical studies have shown that this alignment emerges early in training [34], with recent works identifying multi-phase alignment dynamics [10, 7], implicit regularization effects [8], and block-structured NTKs aligned with class semantics [9, 23].

For GradPCA, this block structure is particularly important: it enables an efficient approximation of the NTK using only class-mean gradients. This insight underpins the core design of GradPCA, linking NTK alignment theory with a practical OOD detection mechanism.

## B Additional Theory and Proofs

### B.1 Support-Based OOD Detection

In this section, we provide further motivation for the support-based formulation of the OOD detection problem introduced in Section 2.

**No free lunch for OOD detection.** Most of the OOD detection literature adopts a probabilistic view, where a detector  $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  must decide whether a sample  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is *more likely* to be drawn from the in-distribution  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  or some out-distribution  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ . However,  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$  is unknown in practice. Typically, we only have access to samples from  $\mu_{\text{id}}$ , and aim to construct a detector that performs well across a range of possible, unseen  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$  distributions (e.g., different OOD datasets).

This objective is fundamentally ill-posed: without assumptions on  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ , no detector can guarantee reliable performance. The following result formalizes this observation.

**Theorem B.1.** (No free lunch) *For any OOD detector  $D$  and fixed in-distribution  $\mu_{\text{id}}$ , there exists an out-distribution  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$  such that the performance of  $D$  is no better than random guessing.*

*Proof.* Let  $D : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  to be an OOD detector. Let  $A_0 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : D(x) = 0\}$  and  $A_1 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : D(x) = 1\}$ . Denote  $Y$  a random variable such that  $Y = 1$  if  $X \sim \mu_{\text{ood}}$  and  $Y = 0$  if  $X \sim \mu_{\text{id}}$ . Then we have the following for the detector error probability:

$$\mathbb{E}[D(X) \neq Y] = P[A_1|Y = 0]P[Y = 0] + P[A_0|Y = 1]P[Y = 1]. \quad (11)$$

Moreover, noticing that  $P[A_1|Y = 0] = \mu_{\text{id}}(A_1)$  and  $P[A_0|Y = 1] = \mu_{\text{ood}}(A_0)$ , and assuming that the samples are sampled from in- and -out-distribution with equal probability, i.e.  $P[Y = 0] = P[Y = 1] = 1/2$ , we can write:

$$\mathbb{E}[D(X) \neq Y] = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_{\text{id}}(A_1) + \mu_{\text{ood}}(A_0)) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \mu_{\text{id}}(A_1) - \mu_{\text{ood}}(A_1)). \quad (12)$$

If  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  and  $D$  are fixed but  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$  is arbitrary, one can always construct a distribution  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$  such that  $\mu_{\text{ood}}(A_1) \leq \mu_{\text{id}}(A_1)$ , causing the detector to perform no better than random guessing.  $\square$

**Likelihood vs. support.** In the probabilistic view of OOD detection, the optimal detector for a given pair  $(\mu_{\text{id}}, \mu_{\text{ood}})$  naturally depends on likelihoods under both distributions. Specifically, as follows from the proof of Theorem B.1, the set of inputs flagged as OOD by the ideal detector should satisfy:

$$A_1^* \in \arg \min_{A_1} \mu_{\text{id}}(A_1) - \mu_{\text{ood}}(A_1), \quad (13)$$

which yields the likelihood-based optimal detector:

$$D^*(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \mu_{\text{id}}(x) < \mu_{\text{ood}}(x) \\ 0, & \mu_{\text{id}}(x) \geq \mu_{\text{ood}}(x). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

However, this formulation leads to a conceptual issue: the classification of a fixed input  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  as ID or OOD may vary depending on the choice of  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ , even though  $\mu_{\text{id}}(x)$  remains constant. This is counterintuitive in practical OOD detection, where the goal is to determine whether a model can reliably predict the label of  $x$ . Since the choice of  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$  does not influence the model's prediction for  $x$ , it should not determine whether  $x$  is considered OOD.

In contrast, the support-based perspective avoids this issue by providing an optimal detector that is independent of  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ . Here, we define  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  as the distribution over inputs the model can correctly classify, and any input outside  $\text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})$  is considered beyond the model's competence. This aligns better with the practical objective of OOD detection: identifying inputs where the model is likely to fail.

## B.2 Sufficient Condition for Spectral OOD Detection (Theorem 4.1)

**Theorem** (Sufficient condition for spectral OOD detection). *Let  $X \sim \mu_{\text{id}}$  and  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$  be any function from  $L^2(\mu_{\text{id}})$ . Consider the covariance matrix*

$$\mathbf{S}(h) := \mathbb{E}[h(X)h(X)^\top]. \quad (15)$$

*Let  $\mathcal{P}h(x)$  be the orthogonal projection of  $h(x)$  onto the range of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , if  $\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|_2 < \|h(x)\|_2$  and  $h$  is continuous at  $x$ , then  $x$  is OOD.*

*Proof.* Since the row space of a matrix is perpendicular to its kernel,  $\mathbf{v} := h(x) - \mathcal{P}h(x)$  is in the kernel of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{S}(h)\mathbf{v} = 0$ . Hence

$$\|\mathbf{v}^\top h\|_{L^2(\mu_{\text{id}})}^2 = \mathbf{v}^\top \left[ \int h(x')h(x')^\top d\mu_{\text{id}}(x') \right] \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S}(h)\mathbf{v} = 0. \quad (16)$$

Now we will prove the result by contradiction. Suppose  $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})$ . Note that since

$$\mathbf{v}^\top h(x) = \|h(x)\|_2^2 - \|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|_2^2 > 0, \quad (17)$$

by the continuity of  $h$  at  $x$ , there exists some ball  $B_\epsilon(x)$  such that  $\mathbf{v}^\top h(x') \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^\top h(x)$  on  $B$ . Since  $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})$ ,  $\mu_{\text{id}}(B_\epsilon(x)) > 0$ . Thus we have

$$\|\mathbf{v}^\top h\|_{L^2(\mu_{\text{id}})}^2 \geq \int_{x' \in B_\epsilon(x)} (\mathbf{v}^\top h(x'))^2 d\mu_{\text{id}}(x') \geq \frac{1}{4}\mu_{\text{id}}(B_\epsilon(x)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}^\top h(x))^2 > 0. \quad (18)$$

However, this contradicts (16). Thus  $x \notin \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})$  and hence is OOD.  $\square$

*Remark B.2.* Theorem 4.1 has the following properties:

1. **Distribution-free:** The result makes no assumptions on either the in-distribution  $\mu_{\text{id}}$  or the out-distribution  $\mu_{\text{ood}}$ , making it completely distribution-free.
2. **Deterministic condition:** By adopting the support-based perspective, the theorem provides a deterministic condition that guarantees a point  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is out-of-distribution, rather than relying on high-probability bounds.
3. **Flexibility in feature map choice:** The theorem applies to any (almost everywhere) continuous function  $h \in L^2(\mu_{\text{id}})$ , which may represent logits, activations, gradients, or other feature maps useful for OOD detection. This generality allows the result to cover a wide range of existing spectral methods.

### B.3 Connection to PCA (Theorem 4.2)

Before proving Theorem 4.2, we restate a simplified version of the Davis–Kahan  $\sin \Theta$  theorem [30], which plays a central role in our analysis:

**Theorem B.3** (Davis–Kahan  $\sin \Theta$  theorem). *Let  $A$  and  $B = A + E$  be self-adjoint matrices in  $\mathbb{R}^{P \times P}$ , with eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_P$  and  $\hat{\lambda}_1 \geq \dots \geq \hat{\lambda}_P$ , respectively. Fix  $k \in \{1, \dots, P\}$ , and let  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times k}$  and  $\hat{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times k}$  contain the top- $k$  eigenvectors of  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. Define the spectral gap:*

$$\Delta := \inf |\lambda - \hat{\lambda}| : \lambda \in [\lambda_k, \lambda_1], \hat{\lambda} \in (-\infty, \hat{\lambda}_{k+1}). \quad (19)$$

*Then the following bound holds:*

$$\|\sin \Theta(\text{span}(V), \text{span}(\hat{V}))\|_2 \leq \frac{\|E\|_2}{\Delta}. \quad (20)$$

*In particular, for the corresponding orthogonal projections  $\mathcal{P}k = VV^\top$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}k = \hat{V}\hat{V}^\top$ , we have:*

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{P}}k - \mathcal{P}k\|_2 \leq \frac{2\|E\|_2}{\Delta}. \quad (21)$$

A generalization of this result is available in [69]; the version presented here follows the formulation in [70]. We now proceed to the proof of our main result.

**Theorem** (Robustness of PCA). *Consider PCA applied to a matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times P}$  (e.g., estimated from a noisy sample). Let  $h$  and  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  be as in Theorem 4.1, and assume the following:*

$$\|\mathbf{S}(h) - \hat{\mathbf{S}}\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{rank}(\mathbf{S}(h)) = C, \quad (22)$$

*i.e.,  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$  approximates a rank- $C$  covariance matrix  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . Let  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_C$  denote the orthogonal projector onto the top  $C$  eigenvectors of  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ , and let  $\lambda_C$  be the  $C$ -th largest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . Then, for any input  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the following condition is sufficient to guarantee that  $x$  is OOD:*

$$s_{\text{PCA}}(x) < 1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda_C - \epsilon}, \quad s_{\text{PCA}}(x) := \frac{\|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_C h(x)\|_2^2}{\|h(x)\|_2^2}. \quad (23)$$



*Proof.* We prove the result by applying the Davis-Kahan theorem to matrices  $\mathbf{S}(h) \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times P}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times P}$ . Suppose the eigenvalues of (symmetric positive definite)  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$  are, respectively  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_P$  and  $\hat{\lambda}_1 \leq \hat{\lambda}_2 \leq \dots \leq \hat{\lambda}_P$ . From the low-rank condition, we have that  $\lambda_{C+1} = \dots = \lambda_P = 0$ .

To show the relationship between the score functions corresponding to  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ , we notice the following:

$$|s(x) - s_{\text{PCA}}(x)| = \left| \frac{\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|_2^2 - \|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_C h(x)\|_2^2}{\|h(x)\|_2^2} \right| \leq \|\mathcal{P} - \hat{\mathcal{P}}_C\|_2, \quad (24)$$

where the inequality follows from the observation that projection matrices are symmetric and idempotent:

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^\top = \mathcal{P}^2. \quad (25)$$

Now we notice that the spectral gap defined in (19) is given by:

$$\Delta = \inf\{|\lambda - \hat{\lambda}| : \lambda \in [\lambda_C, \lambda_1], \hat{\lambda} \in (-\infty, \hat{\lambda}_{C+1})\} = \lambda_C - \hat{\lambda}_{C+1} \geq \lambda_C - \epsilon, \quad (26)$$

since  $\lambda_{C+1}$  is zero, and  $\|\mathbf{S}(h) - \hat{\mathbf{S}}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$  by assumption. Therefore, applying the Davis-Kahan theorem, we get:

$$\|\mathcal{P} - \hat{\mathcal{P}}_C\|_2 \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda_C - \epsilon}. \quad (27)$$

Together with (24), this completes the proof, this implies the following for the score functions:

$$|s(x) - s_{\text{PCA}}(x)| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda_C - \epsilon}. \quad (28)$$

Finally, from Theorem 4.1, we know that the following condition is sufficient to guarantee that  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is OOD (i.e.,  $x \notin \text{supp}(\mu_{\text{id}})$ ):

$$s(x) < 1, \quad s(x) = \frac{\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|_2^2}{\|h(x)\|_2^2}, \quad (29)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the projection on the range of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . Moreover, by (28), we have:

$$s(x) < s_{\text{PCA}}(x) + \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda_C - \epsilon}. \quad (30)$$

Therefore, the sufficient condition in terms of  $s_{\text{PCA}}(x)$  is given by

$$s_{\text{PCA}}(x) + \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda_C - \epsilon} < 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad s_{\text{PCA}}(x) < 1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{\lambda_C - \epsilon}. \quad (31)$$

□

#### B.4 Sample Complexity of Covariance Matrix

Before proving the main result, we first state the following concentration bound for empirical covariance estimation:

**Theorem B.4** (Rudelson–Vershynin [71, Thm. 3.1]). *Let  $Y$  be a random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\|Y\|_2 \leq M$  almost surely and  $\|\mathbb{E}[Y \otimes Y]\|_2 \leq 1$ . For independent copies  $Y_1, \dots, Y_N$  set*

$$\Gamma_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i \otimes Y_i - \mathbb{E}[Y \otimes Y], \quad a := C M \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}},$$

where  $C > 0$  is universal. Then

(i) **(Expectation)** If  $a < 1$  one has  $\mathbb{E}\|\Gamma_N\|_2 \leq a$ .

(ii) **(Tail)** For every  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\Pr\{\|\Gamma_N\|_2 > t\} \leq 2 \exp(-c t^2 / a^2)$ , where  $c > 0$  is universal.

Now we are ready to state and prove the main result of this section:

**Theorem B.5** (Sample complexity of covariance matrix). *Assume  $\|h(x)\| \leq R$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and let*

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}}(h) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(x_i)h(x_i)^\top \quad (32)$$

*be the approximation of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  from a sample of size  $N$ . Denote  $s_{\text{PCA}}$  and  $\hat{s}_{\text{PCA}}$  the PCA score functions for  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}(h)$  respectively (as defined in Eq. (7)). Then for any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  we have the following:*

$$|s_{\text{PCA}}(x) - \hat{s}_{\text{PCA}}(x)| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\Delta - \epsilon}, \quad \epsilon := \frac{2CR^2}{\Delta} \sqrt{\frac{\log(N/\delta)}{N}}, \quad (33)$$

*where  $C > 0$  is a universal constant, and  $\Delta := \lambda_C - \lambda_{C+1}$  is the spectral gap of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ .*

*Proof.* We start by defining rescaled feature maps  $\tilde{h}(x) = \frac{h(x)}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}$ , where  $\lambda_1$  is the largest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$ . This rescaling ensures  $\|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{h} \otimes \tilde{h}]\|_2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{S}(h)\|_2}{\lambda_1} = 1$ , as required by Theorem B.4. Additionally, we have  $\|\tilde{h}(x)\|_2 \leq \frac{R}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}$  almost surely. Then, applying Theorem B.4 with  $M = \frac{R}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}$ , we obtain that for any parameter  $t \in (0, 1)$ :

$$\Pr \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}(x_i) \otimes \tilde{h}(x_i) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h} \otimes \tilde{h}] \right\|_2 > t \right] \leq 2 \exp \left( -c \frac{t^2 N}{M^2} \right)$$

where  $c > 0$  is a universal constant.

Setting  $t = C' \frac{R}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(N/\delta)}{N}}$  for an appropriate constant  $C'$ , we get:

$$\Pr \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}(x_i) \otimes \tilde{h}(x_i) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h} \otimes \tilde{h}] \right\|_2 > C' \frac{R}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(N/\delta)}{N}} \right] \leq \delta$$

Rescaling back to the original features, we have:

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{S}}(h) - \mathbf{S}(h)\|_2 = \lambda_1 \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{h}(x_i) \otimes \tilde{h}(x_i) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h} \otimes \tilde{h}] \right\|_2 \leq C' R \sqrt{\lambda_1} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n/\delta)}{n}}$$

Since  $\lambda_1 \leq \|\mathbf{S}\|_2 \leq R^2$  (by our assumption that  $\|h(x)\|_2 \leq R$ ), we can further simplify this to:

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{S}}(h) - \mathbf{S}(h)\|_2 \leq CR^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(N/\delta)}{N}}$$

for a universal constant  $C$ .

The remainder of the argument follows analogously to the proof of Theorem 4.2.  $\square$

## B.5 Necessary Condition for Spectral OOD Detection (Theorem 4.5)

**Theorem** (Necessary condition for spectral OOD detection). *Consider the same setting as in Theorem 4.1 and the spectral OOD detector  $D_h$  defined in Eq. (5) with arbitrary threshold  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ . Then the following condition is necessary for the efficiency (i.e., non-zero sensitivity) of  $D_h$ :*

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}(h)) < \dim(\{h(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}). \quad (34)$$

*Proof.* As per Theorem 4.1, the range of  $\mathbf{S}(h)$  has to be included into the full image of the feature map  $\text{span}(\{h(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}) \subset \mathbb{R}^P$ , we have

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}(h)) \leq \dim(\{h(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}). \quad (35)$$

In case of equality, we have  $\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\| = \|h(x)\|$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore, a detector of the form

$$D_h(x) := \mathbb{1}_{[0, \delta)}(s(x)), \quad s(x) := \frac{\|\mathcal{P}h(x)\|^2}{\|h(x)\|^2} \quad (36)$$

does not identify a single OOD point and, thus, has sensitivity (true positives rate) equal to zero. Therefore, by contradiction, strict inequality is necessary for effectiveness of  $D_h$ .  $\square$

## C Implementation Details

In this section, we describe the implementation of GradPCA and all baselines, along with details about the pretrained models used in our experimental setup.

### C.1 GradPCA Implementation

We implement GradPCA as a custom class compatible with JAX transformations, leveraging the `struct` module from the Flax library [72]. We chose JAX [36] (with Flax as the deep learning framework) for two main reasons: (1) its automatic differentiation system provides a clean, expressive interface for working with neural network gradients, which are central to our method; and (2) its just-in-time (JIT) compilation enables competitive runtime performance with minimal low-level optimization.

The GradPCA class includes several configurable parameters that control which variant of the method is executed:

- **Method:** Specifies how principal directions are computed. We support three options:
  1. *Block structure (default):* Computes directions using class-mean gradients, as described in the main text.
  2. *Batch:* Computes gradients over a batch and estimates directions via SVD of the dual matrix.
  3. *GradOrth:* Implements the GradOrth method from recent literature [38] (also included in the baselines) using SVD of the covariance matrix of the last-layer activations instead of the NTK for estimating principal components. For consistency with the original GradOrth paper, this variant uses loss gradients (with uniform vector as label) rather than output gradients.
- **Parameter subset:** Specifies which subset of model parameters to differentiate with respect to (as a list of keys in the parameter dictionary). In our main experiments, we use only the parameters from the last hidden layer. Additionally, we include ablations for CIFAR-10 (see Appendix E).
- **Spectral threshold  $\epsilon$ :** Used to truncate the spectrum of size  $C$  at the smallest  $K$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i / \sum_{i=1}^C \lambda_i \geq \epsilon$ . The default  $\epsilon = 0.99$  typically retains the full or nearly full spectrum on moderate-class datasets such as CIFAR.
- **Aggregation:** A boolean flag controlling whether to aggregate gradients across all  $C$  output heads (via summing) before PCA (when `True`), or to compute separate scores for each head (when `False`). While the non-aggregated version allows finer analysis, it is computationally demanding and practical only for small-class datasets like CIFAR-10. Our main benchmarks use the aggregated version.
- **Sparsification (DICE):** An option to sparsify gradients before PCA, roughly following the DICE method [35]. Sparsification is based on parameter magnitudes (not gradient values) and requires specifying a sparsity level  $p$ , which determines the fraction of parameters removed. The method applies sparsification independently to each parameter matrix.

The GradPCA variants discussed in the main text correspond to the following configurations: the default **GradPCA** uses the block structure method with  $\epsilon = 0.99$ , the parameter subset restricted to the last hidden layer (classifier) parameters, and aggregation enabled. **GradPCA-Batch** uses the batch method with  $\epsilon = 0.97$ . **GradPCA-Vec** disables aggregation. **GradPCA+DICE** enables the sparsification option with the default sparsity parameter  $p = 0.8$ . In the following paragraphs, we describe the high-level logic of the training and inference procedures for GradPCA.

**Training (offline) phase.** Training is initiated upon instantiating the GradPCA class and executed over the input dataset. At the end of training, the computed principal component vectors are stored as attributes of the class for use during inference. The procedure requires a training state (i.e., model and parameter values) and GradPCA configuration parameters. The input dataset must be provided as a function that returns a per-class data loader, allowing compatibility with varied loading pipelines. The training loop computes gradient class-means by sequentially evaluating gradients over batches

of configurable size. This implementation is fully scalable to large datasets and has computational requirements comparable to a single training epoch. Once the gradient class-means are computed, the remaining steps follow directly from Algorithm 1.

**Inference (online) phase.** During inference, the principal components—stored as attributes of the GradPCA instance—are used to compute scores by projecting the input gradients onto these components. Since inference speed is critical for OOD detection, efficient parallelization plays a key role. The optimal strategy depends on factors such as batch size, the size of the parameter subset, the number of principal components, and hardware capabilities. In practice, it may be more efficient to parallelize over either the batch dimension or the principal components. Our implementation supports both options, though for consistency, we use parallelization over principal components in our runtime evaluations (Appendix D).

## C.2 Baselines Implementation

For most baselines—excluding gradient-based methods GAIA and GradOrth—we use implementations from the Detectors library [39]. This ensures consistent, efficient, and reproducible comparisons. To emphasize fairness in our main evaluations, we apply each baseline with the same hyperparameters across all benchmarks (matching our use of a single GradPCA variant without tuning). Below, we detail the specific settings used for each method.

**Max logits.** This baseline uses the maximum logit value as the OOD score and requires no additional parameters.

**ODIN.** We set the softmax temperature to 1000, the default in the Detectors library.

**Energy.** The softmax temperature is fixed at 1.0, following the library’s default.

**DICE.** We set the sparsity parameter to  $p = 0.7$ , which specifies the fraction of weights removed from the last layer. This value is the default in Detectors and follows the recommendation from the original DICE paper [35], particularly for ImageNet. As there is no principled strategy for selecting this parameter, we adopt the known optimal setting for ImageNet across all experiments. In most cases, this baseline performs reasonably well. However, we observe that it completely fails on the CIFAR-10 BiT-M model, resulting in an AUC of just 35%, while other logit-based methods succeed. This illustrates a failure mode where the core assumption of DICE—that pruning small weights at a given sparsity level improves ID-OOD separation—does not hold.

**Mahalanobis.** We extract features from the penultimate layer and estimate the class-conditional means and covariance matrix from samples (using mean aggregation and sample covariance, as in Detectors). Since this method is computationally intensive, we use the full training data for CIFAR, but limit ImageNet training to a 50,000-sample subset. For the ImageNet benchmark (Table 2), we report average performance along with standard deviations over three independent runs.

**KNN.** We use penultimate-layer features and evaluate based on the 10 nearest neighbors. Because KNN inference time scales poorly with dataset size, we subsample 10,000 points for training in all settings to maintain acceptable runtime—even for CIFAR. We report average performance along with standard deviations over three independent runs in the main benchmarks for this baseline.

**ReAct.** We apply ReAct to penultimate-layer features, using a clipping threshold of 0.9—the default value in Detectors. As with Mahalanobis, we use the full training split for CIFAR and a 50,000-sample subset for ImageNet. We report average performance along with standard deviations over three independent runs for ImageNet. Similar to DICE, this baseline performs well on several benchmarks but fails completely ( $\text{AUC} < 50\%$ ) on the CIFAR-10 BiT-M model (where DICE also fails) and the CIFAR-100 ResNet-34 model. This highlights the inconsistency of ReAct’s core assumption—at least under a fixed hyperparameter setup—across our evaluation.

**GAIA.** GAIA is not included in the Detectors library, but the authors provide open-source code. While their implementation is architecture-dependent, they include support for ResNet-34 and BiT models, which enables direct comparison using their original setup.

**GradOrth.** GradOrth [38] is a recent gradient-based spectral method that differs from GradPCA in two key ways: (1) it uses gradients of the loss function rather than the model output, and (2) it derives dominant directions via SVD on the last-layer activations, rather than NTK structure. Since no official implementation was released, we reimplemented GradOrth within the GradPCA framework based on the paper’s description. However, due to insufficient implementation details in the paper (e.g., handling the cost of large-batch gradient computation), we cannot guarantee full fidelity to the original. In our setup, GradOrth consistently underperforms on most benchmarks—a result that may reflect the weak alignment between dominant directions in activation and gradient space.

### C.3 Models

We use two classes of models in our experiments: ResNetV2 models from the Big Transfer (BiT) repository [73, 46], and ResNet34 models from the PyTorch Image Models (TIMM) library [47]. Since GradPCA is implemented in JAX and most baselines are implemented in PyTorch, our comparison setup relies on translating shared models between the two frameworks.

**ResNetV2 (BiT).** BiT models are publicly available and widely used in the OOD literature. These are ResNetV2 architectures pretrained either on ImageNet-1k (BiT-S) or on ImageNet-21k (BiT-M), with additional BiT-M variants fine-tuned for smaller datasets such as CIFAR (after pretraining). We use these released models in our experiments.

BiT models are supported in both JAX and PyTorch. We use the official implementations for both frameworks, enabling a direct comparison between GradPCA and baselines. We confirm that the Torch and JAX versions of these models yield nearly identical accuracy, ensuring consistent evaluation.

**ResNet34 (TIMM).** The TIMM library provides a wide range of pretrained models, including ones for smaller datasets like CIFAR, while many popular frameworks offer only ImageNet-pretrained versions. We select the ResNet34 model to align with the setup of the GAIA method [19], which reports strong results on this architecture. However, we note that their reported performance is based on a custom-trained version of ResNet34, which we cannot replicate using the standard TIMM model.

TIMM models are not directly available in JAX, so we implement a custom conversion. Despite matching the architecture exactly, direct translation leads to a noticeable accuracy drop—likely due to numerical inconsistencies and subtle differences in layer implementations between PyTorch and Flax. For instance, the converted model achieves 93% accuracy on CIFAR-10 (vs. 95% in PyTorch) and 72% on CIFAR-100 (vs. 78%).

To ensure fairness, we fine-tune the converted JAX models for 10 epochs using float32 precision and a small learning rate, correcting for conversion artifacts without altering the weights significantly. We then convert the fine-tuned model back to PyTorch, which restores the original performance. This strategy guarantees consistent model behavior across frameworks. We release all model checkpoints (both JAX and PyTorch) with our code.

## D Computational Costs

In this section, we break down the computational performance of GradPCA and compare it with baseline methods. The total cost involves two key components: the *training (offline) phase* and the *inference (online) phase*. While online efficiency is critical for real-time deployment, the offline phase must also be scalable enough to run on standard hardware. We discuss each phase in turn below, and also review memory requirements and provide an estimate of the total compute time for the project.

**Inference (online) phase.** The inference-time performance of GradPCA and baselines is summarized in Table 3. GradPCA is highly efficient on CIFAR, evaluating over 2,000 samples per second—well within the range for real-time deployment. However, like all methods, its performance degrades on ImageNet, which presents significantly greater computational challenges.

Our implementation parallelizes GradPCA over the principal components, making its runtime relatively insensitive to the number of classes or components, provided sufficient GPU memory is



Methods	Training	CIFAR-10		CIFAR-100		ImageNet-1k	
		ResNetV2-50	ResNet34	ResNetV2-50	ResNet34	ResNetV2-101	ResNetV2-50
Max logits		2828 s/s	5049 s/s	2572 s/s	4347 s/s	425 s/s	427 s/s
MSP		2831 s/s	5565 s/s	2825 s/s	5690 s/s	459 s/s	475 s/s
ODIN		2817 s/s	5060 s/s	2592 s/s	5436 s/s	456 s/s	473 s/s
Energy		2815 s/s	5750 s/s	2648 s/s	5123 s/s	458 s/s	476 s/s
DICE		2815 s/s	5731 s/s	2733 s/s	5141 s/s	457 s/s	476 s/s
Mahalanobis	✓	2538 s/s	4915 s/s	2108 s/s	3881 s/s	363 s/s	376 s/s
KNN	✓	449 s/s	1462 s/s	449 s/s	1476 s/s	88 s/s	89 s/s
ReAct	✓	2809 s/s	5413 s/s	2838 s/s	5117 s/s	459 s/s	484 s/s
GAIA-A		139 s/s	247 s/s	129 s/s	241 s/s	303 s/s	245 s/s
GAIA-Z		317 s/s	489 s/s	307 s/s	472 s/s	309 s/s	390 s/s
<b>GradPCA</b>	✓	2654 samples/s	2440 samples/s	1974 samples/s	2311 samples/s	103 samples/s	128 samples/s

Table 3: Runtime of OOD detection methods evaluated on NVIDIA RTX A6000. Each method allows batch-evaluation, the results in the table show the average runtime per sample when evaluating batches of size 128. The time includes standardized data loading routine (TFDS loader).

available. The negligible difference in runtime between CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 supports this. The slowdown on ImageNet is primarily due to the increased cost of a single projection, resulting from the larger parameter matrix in the last hidden layer. This cost could potentially be reduced by further limiting the subset of parameters used in gradient computation.

**Training (offline) phase.** The offline phase of GradPCA involves computing average class Jacobians over an input dataset (or a subset thereof). Jacobians are evaluated batch-wise, with a configurable batch size. As a result, the training time scales approximately with the dataset size divided by the batch size and is comparable to the time required for a single training epoch.

In our experiments, using the ResNetV2-50 model and an NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU, we observed the following training times over the full datasets: approximately 2 minutes for CIFAR-10, 10 minutes for CIFAR-100, and 90 minutes for ImageNet-1k.

**Memory requirements.** Like other regularity-based methods, GradPCA incurs a memory overhead for storing the principal component vectors. The number of components retained depends on the spectral threshold  $\epsilon$ , but we can estimate the *maximum* memory requirement as  $O(CP)$ , where  $C$  is the number of classes and  $P$  is the number of parameters per class-specific vector.

In our setup using the ResNetV2-50 model (float32 precision, accounting for the fact that  $P$  scales with  $C$  in the final layer), this corresponds to the following worst-case memory usage: approximately 7.8 MB for CIFAR-10, 78 MB for CIFAR-100, and 7.5 GB for ImageNet. While the worst-case cost on ImageNet is relatively high, the actual memory usage in most experiments is much lower. This is because the default  $\epsilon = 0.99$  threshold typically retains fewer than half of the principal components.

**Total computational cost.** The main computational cost of our project comes from training on the ImageNet benchmarks, including ablation studies. Specifically, we conducted 15 ImageNet runs each for ResNetV2-50 and ResNetV2-101, totaling approximately 45 hours of training time on an NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU, with under 5 hours needed for evaluation. In comparison, the CIFAR experiments required significantly less compute, amounting to fewer than 10 GPU hours in total. Overall, we estimate the total computational cost of our results to be under 60 GPU hours on an NVIDIA RTX A6000.

## E Additional Experiments

This section presents additional experimental results not included in the main paper, specifically the CIFAR-10 benchmark and ablation studies on GradPCA variants.

### E.1 CIFAR-10 Benchmark

The setup of the CIFAR-10 benchmark is identical to that of CIFAR-100, as described in Section 5. As shown in Table 4, similar to the CIFAR-100 results, regularity-based methods achieve state-of-the-art performance on the pretrained model, while abnormality-based methods perform better on the non-pretrained model, with GAIA achieving the best results.

	Methods	SVHN		Places		LSUN-c		LSUN-r		iSUN		Textures		Average	
		FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑
ResNetV2-50 (BIT-M)	Max logits	50.37	76.11	50.81	69.44	37.91	84.08	42.32	83.15	45.28	81.91	24.34	89.65	41.84	80.72
	MSP	39.49	83.72	44.42	75.93	29.7	89.45	35.85	87.58	37.41	87.31	18.16	93.12	34.17	86.18
	ODIN	50.35	76.14	50.82	69.44	37.92	84.09	42.29	83.16	45.28	81.92	24.33	89.66	41.83	80.74
	Energy	60.77	72.3	55.52	67.12	46.99	81.06	49.87	80.69	53.08	79.06	30.42	87.53	49.44	77.96
	DICE	99.67	40.58	100.0	13.14	99.74	43.25	99.88	44.5	99.88	44.0	100.0	22.87	99.86	34.72
	Mahalanobis	9.07	98.19	<b>1.64</b>	<b>99.6</b>	6.06	98.65	<b>17.36</b>	<b>97.04</b>	<b>16.24</b>	<b>97.13</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>99.97</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>98.43</b>
	KNN	1.99	99.42	<b>5.52</b>	<b>98.74</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>99.43</b>	9.77	<b>98.11</b>	9.49	98.03	<b>0.18</b>	<b>99.94</b>	<b>4.85</b>	<b>98.95</b>
	ReAct	99.54	28.46	99.98	15.52	98.03	46.36	99.59	38.91	99.41	39.24	95.77	41.93	98.72	35.07
	GAIA-A	41.53	90.09	18.16	96.51	24.36	94.67	35.86	92.51	35.88	92.18	10.74	97.87	27.75	93.97
	GAIA-Z	57.6	87.0	89.31	68.1	51.87	82.62	97.72	48.22	92.07	57.25	9.13	98.0	66.28	73.53
	GradOrth	40.29	92.34	27.43	94.31	33.19	93.74	68.02	84.25	64.44	85.38	2.25	99.31	39.27	91.56
	GradPCA	6.92	98.67	23.16	94.41	15.1	97.21	36.76	92.97	37.65	92.74	1.33	99.73	20.15	95.96
	GradPCA (block 4)	<b>5.11</b>	<b>99.01</b>	10.96	97.25	<b>6.01</b>	<b>98.9</b>	20.02	96.49	19.87	96.49	0.62	99.87	10.43	98.0
	GradPCA-Vec	6.08	98.77	11.01	97.47	6.59	98.76	17.94	96.82	17.05	96.84	<b>0.36</b>	99.91	9.84	98.1
	GradPCA+DICE	10.98	97.96	28.77	93.35	17.95	96.78	41.07	92.2	41.67	92.12	1.17	99.67	23.6	95.35
	GradPCA-Batch	<b>0.52</b>	<b>99.73</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>99.3</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>99.45</b>	<b>6.48</b>	<b>98.67</b>	<b>5.55</b>	<b>98.74</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>99.99</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>99.31</b>
ResNet-34 (TIMM)	Max logits	20.07	95.06	40.8	86.61	22.45	94.36	28.55	92.84	30.47	91.98	48.6	83.94	31.82	90.8
	MSP	37.47	93.99	54.45	87.5	39.86	93.11	45.9	91.82	47.18	91.09	58.52	85.96	47.23	90.58
	ODIN	20.07	95.06	40.78	86.61	22.45	94.36	28.52	92.84	30.47	91.98	48.6	83.94	31.81	90.8
	Energy	19.15	95.16	40.02	86.68	21.57	94.46	27.68	92.94	29.51	92.08	47.75	83.95	30.95	90.88
	DICE	<b>16.01</b>	95.38	44.33	82.84	20.52	93.83	30.96	90.62	32.09	89.81	52.31	79.5	32.7	88.66
	Mahalanobis	69.9	87.63	56.02	89.2	59.66	90.4	45.49	92.2	47.78	91.83	51.6	91.31	55.08	90.43
	KNN	37.25	94.3	42.12	92.22	31.81	94.93	29.99	95.33	31.97	94.82	42.03	92.77	35.86	94.06
	ReAct	21.07	92.95	42.94	85.72	21.71	92.89	29.37	91.89	31.88	90.78	50.37	82.23	32.89	89.41
	GAIA-A	25.07	95.12	<b>29.54</b>	<b>94.44</b>	<b>13.45</b>	<b>97.53</b>	<b>18.16</b>	<b>96.9</b>	<b>19.95</b>	<b>96.66</b>	<b>16.76</b>	<b>96.79</b>	<b>20.49</b>	<b>96.24</b>
	GAIA-Z	<b>4.39</b>	<b>98.79</b>	<b>32.34</b>	91.7	<b>5.27</b>	<b>98.87</b>	<b>13.06</b>	<b>97.32</b>	<b>12.56</b>	<b>97.47</b>	<b>9.02</b>	<b>98.21</b>	<b>12.77</b>	<b>97.06</b>
	GradOrth	72.38	80.13	87.4	61.27	61.82	76.02	87.34	60.34	87.32	61.59	75.14	67.42	78.57	67.8
	GradPCA	48.56	90.27	34.75	<b>92.29</b>	31.29	93.81	27.09	95.0	30.02	94.19	49.22	91.54	36.82	92.85
	GradPCA (block 3)	<b>15.07</b>	<b>97.01</b>	<b>24.87</b>	<b>95.33</b>	<b>11.06</b>	<b>97.49</b>	<b>19.63</b>	<b>96.54</b>	<b>20.92</b>	<b>96.32</b>	<b>25.78</b>	<b>95.86</b>	<b>19.55</b>	<b>96.42</b>
	GradPCA-Vec	25.34	95.91	49.1	91.17	26.09	95.75	42.47	93.32	44.35	92.68	42.92	92.64	38.38	93.58
	GradPCA+DICE	62.5	84.04	39.54	90.26	42.09	90.03	33.33	92.87	36.85	91.7	55.38	88.21	44.95	89.52
	GradPCA-Batch	24.9	<b>95.95</b>	48.65	91.14	25.22	95.87	42.32	93.29	44.41	92.59	43.29	92.46	38.13	93.55

Table 4: **CIFAR-10**. The methods achieving the top-3 performance metrics are highlighted in bold, with the best-performing method shown in **orange**, the second in **green**, and the third in **blue**.

Due to the smaller number of classes, this benchmark is significantly more computationally accessible than the others. This makes it feasible to apply GradPCA-Vec and GradPCA-Batch, as well as to perform GradPCA on a much larger subset of parameters beyond just the penultimate layer—resulting in improved performance. While these variants may be impractical for benchmarks with a larger number of classes, we recommend their use on smaller benchmarks to fully leverage the capabilities of GradPCA.

## E.2 Ablation: Spectral Threshold Parameter

In the default version of GradPCA, used throughout all benchmark tables, we set the spectral threshold parameter to  $\epsilon = 0.99$ . For datasets with a small number of classes—such as CIFAR-10—performance is largely insensitive to this parameter, as any  $\epsilon > 0.90$  typically results in selecting all  $C - 1$  principal components. However, for datasets with a large number of classes, the choice of  $\epsilon$  can have a more significant effect. To assess its impact, we conduct ablation studies on ImageNet (Table 5) and CIFAR-100 (Table 6).

	Methods	Places		SUN		iNaturalist		Textures		Average	
		FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑
BIT-M	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.90$ )	85.96	66.47	78.12	74.95	<b>40.88</b>	<b>92.04</b>	<b>49.33</b>	<b>88.96</b>	<b>63.57</b>	80.6
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.95$ )	<b>83.16</b>	<b>69.62</b>	<b>74.67</b>	<b>77.65</b>	<b>38.14</b>	<b>92.79</b>	<b>51.69</b>	<b>88.67</b>	<b>61.91</b>	<b>82.18</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.97$ )	<b>82.25</b>	<b>70.63</b>	<b>73.7</b>	<b>78.39</b>	<b>38.56</b>	<b>92.77</b>	<b>53.66</b>	<b>88.28</b>	<b>62.04</b>	<b>82.52</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.99$ )	<b>83.12</b>	<b>71.55</b>	<b>75.16</b>	<b>78.68</b>	45.84	91.69	60.74	86.49	66.22	<b>82.1</b>
BIT-S	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.90$ )	72.39	77.45	61.88	83.74	32.52	92.73	19.28	95.92	46.52	87.46
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.95$ )	<b>67.55</b>	<b>79.38</b>	<b>57.11</b>	<b>85.15</b>	<b>22.82</b>	<b>94.54</b>	<b>18.02</b>	<b>96.22</b>	<b>41.38</b>	<b>88.82</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.97$ )	<b>66.08</b>	<b>80.12</b>	<b>55.28</b>	<b>85.66</b>	<b>20.98</b>	<b>95.09</b>	<b>18.38</b>	<b>96.25</b>	<b>40.18</b>	<b>89.28</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.99$ )	<b>61.27</b>	<b>81.75</b>	<b>49.35</b>	<b>87.2</b>	<b>17.78</b>	<b>95.8</b>	<b>18.08</b>	<b>96.14</b>	<b>36.62</b>	<b>90.22</b>

Table 5: **ImageNet-1k**: Ablation of the  $\epsilon$  parameter.

	Methods	SVHN		Places		LSUN-c		LSUN-r		iSUN		Textures		Average	
		FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑
BIT-M	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.90$ )	21.12	95.38	31.2	93.04	12.04	97.76	58.4	86.73	61.57	85.97	4.01	99.09	31.39	93.0
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.95$ )	19.2	<b>95.98</b>	<b>28.88</b>	<b>93.71</b>	8.71	98.37	<b>53.42</b>	<b>88.14</b>	<b>59.02</b>	<b>86.6</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>99.25</b>	<b>28.78</b>	<b>93.68</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.97$ )	17.84	<b>96.38</b>	28.9	93.72	8.95	98.34	<b>52.69</b>	<b>88.47</b>	<b>57.91</b>	<b>86.98</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>99.26</b>	28.26	93.86
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.99$ )	<b>17.2</b>	<b>96.58</b>	<b>29.64</b>	<b>93.56</b>	<b>8.28</b>	<b>98.42</b>	<b>51.75</b>	<b>88.93</b>	<b>56.93</b>	<b>87.34</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>99.24</b>	<b>27.87</b>	<b>94.01</b>
TIMM	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.90$ )	<b>61.15</b>	<b>90.13</b>	<b>55.73</b>	<b>88.11</b>	66.17	85.93	<b>64.94</b>	<b>84.95</b>	<b>66.85</b>	<b>83.96</b>	<b>66.99</b>	<b>86.08</b>	<b>63.49</b>	<b>86.53</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.95$ )	<b>54.55</b>	<b>90.65</b>	<b>60.14</b>	<b>87.83</b>	<b>63.32</b>	<b>87.31</b>	<b>70.95</b>	<b>85.84</b>	<b>71.18</b>	<b>85.13</b>	<b>69.28</b>	<b>86.38</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>87.19</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.97$ )	<b>56.25</b>	<b>90.47</b>	<b>61.97</b>	<b>87.36</b>	<b>61.43</b>	<b>87.93</b>	<b>73.67</b>	<b>84.18</b>	<b>72.86</b>	<b>83.76</b>	<b>70.76</b>	<b>85.03</b>	<b>66.16</b>	<b>86.46</b>
	GradPCA ( $\epsilon = 0.99$ )	61.22	89.1	62.71	87.31	<b>63.45</b>	<b>87.11</b>	73.97	<b>84.25</b>	73.01	<b>83.85</b>	72.3	84.63	67.78	86.04

Table 6: **CIFAR-100**: Ablation of the  $\epsilon$  parameter.

We draw two main observations from this ablation:

1. The optimal value of  $\epsilon$  varies across datasets and model architectures.
2. GradPCA’s performance is largely stable under reasonable changes to  $\epsilon$ .

While tuning  $\epsilon$  may lead to small gains or losses (typically within 1–2% in detection accuracy), there is no clear strategy for selecting an optimal value in advance, as its impact appears to depend on the specific task. Based on these findings, we recommend choosing the largest  $\epsilon$  that remains computationally practical, as this parameter directly controls the number of principal components retained—and therefore the memory cost of GradPCA.

### E.3 Ablation: GradPCA+DICE Sparsity Parameter

In this section, we present ablation results for the sparsity parameter  $p$  used in the GradPCA+DICE variant of our method. GradPCA+DICE applies a mask to sparsify the gradient vectors, retaining only the top  $(1 - p) \times 100\%$  of entries (by magnitude) within the selected parameter subset. Table 7 shows results on ImageNet-1k, and Table 6 reports results on CIFAR-100.

	Methods	Places		SUN		iNaturalist		Textures		Average	
		FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑
ResNetV2-101 (BiT-M)	GradPCA	83.12	71.55	75.16	78.68	45.84	91.69	60.74	86.49	66.22	82.1
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.1$ )	82.71	71.7	74.58	78.9	44.46	91.88	58.82	86.92	65.14	82.35
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.2$ )	82.17	71.84	73.63	79.2	42.3	92.22	56.04	87.68	63.54	82.74
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.3$ )	81.22	72.19	72.03	79.69	39.42	92.62	52.56	88.43	61.31	83.23
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.4$ )	80.49	72.72	70.66	80.31	37.81	92.87	49.79	89.01	59.69	83.73
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.5$ )	79.32	73.2	69.08	80.84	<b>36.54</b>	93.03	47.59	89.46	58.13	84.13
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.6$ )	78.75	73.83	68.16	81.38	<b>36.05</b>	<b>93.25</b>	45.69	89.88	57.16	84.58
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.7$ )	<b>77.55</b>	<b>74.67</b>	<b>65.9</b>	<b>82.22</b>	<b>36.49</b>	<b>93.21</b>	<b>44.87</b>	<b>90.1</b>	<b>56.2</b>	<b>85.05</b>
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.8$ )	<b>76.97</b>	<b>75.51</b>	<b>64.82</b>	<b>82.95</b>	37.68	<b>93.1</b>	<b>44.07</b>	<b>90.4</b>	<b>55.88</b>	<b>85.49</b>
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.9$ )	<b>76.38</b>	<b>76.41</b>	<b>63.81</b>	<b>83.57</b>	39.55	92.87	<b>43.22</b>	<b>90.73</b>	<b>55.74</b>	<b>85.9</b>
ResNetV2-50 (BiT-S)	GradPCA	<b>61.27</b>	<b>81.75</b>	<b>49.35</b>	<b>87.2</b>	<b>17.78</b>	95.8	<b>18.08</b>	96.14	<b>36.62</b>	<b>90.22</b>
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.1$ )	61.51	<b>81.75</b>	49.57	<b>87.21</b>	17.92	95.77	18.22	96.14	36.8	90.22
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.2$ )	61.88	81.54	49.89	87.04	18.02	95.74	<b>18.0</b>	<b>96.15</b>	36.95	90.12
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.3$ )	<b>60.16</b>	<b>82.23</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>87.46</b>	<b>16.97</b>	<b>95.99</b>	18.82	95.98	<b>36.04</b>	<b>90.42</b>
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.4$ )	<b>61.09</b>	<b>81.89</b>	<b>49.49</b>	<b>87.21</b>	<b>17.27</b>	<b>95.92</b>	18.95	95.97	<b>36.7</b>	<b>90.25</b>
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.5$ )	62.24	81.54	50.43	86.92	17.8	<b>95.81</b>	18.98	95.99	37.36	90.06
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.6$ )	62.51	81.41	50.76	86.84	17.97	95.8	19.05	96.01	37.57	90.02
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.7$ )	63.2	81.07	51.41	86.59	18.4	95.64	19.0	96.04	38.0	89.84
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.8$ )	65.07	80.1	53.16	85.85	19.25	95.48	18.16	<b>96.2</b>	38.91	89.41
	GradPCA ( $p = 0.9$ )	67.17	79.07	55.47	85.09	21.61	94.92	<b>17.19</b>	<b>96.42</b>	40.36	88.88

Table 7: **ImageNet-1k**: Ablation of the parameter  $p$  in GradPCA+DICE.

	Methods	SVHN		Places		LSUN-c		LSUN-r		iSUN		Textures		Average	
		FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑
ResNetV2-50 (BiT-M)	GradPCA	17.2	96.38	29.64	93.56	8.28	<b>98.42</b>	51.75	88.93	36.93	87.34	<b>3.41</b>	<b>99.24</b>	27.87	98.01
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.1$ )	17.67	96.31	29.58	93.39	9.5	98.18	<b>48.69</b>	89.98	<b>55.29</b>	87.9	3.85	99.09	27.43	94.14
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.2$ )	17.52	96.43	29.06	93.54	10.26	98.07	49.37	<b>90.13</b>	55.79	88.05	3.98	99.11	27.66	<b>94.22</b>
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.3$ )	<b>16.78</b>	<b>96.59</b>	27.71	<b>93.91</b>	9.31	98.23	<b>48.73</b>	<b>90.17</b>	<b>54.72</b>	<b>88.27</b>	3.52	99.18	26.79	<b>94.39</b>
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.4$ )	<b>17.09</b>	96.62	<b>27.62</b>	<b>94.03</b>	8.92	98.34	48.66	<b>90.0</b>	<b>54.64</b>	<b>88.23</b>	3.3	<b>99.24</b>	26.71	94.41
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.5$ )	17.78	96.57	<b>28.77</b>	<b>93.85</b>	8.65	98.4	50.7	89.44	56.25	87.85	3.53	<b>99.22</b>	27.61	<b>94.22</b>
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.6$ )	17.85	96.55	29.02	93.79	8.44	<b>98.42</b>	51.23	89.19	56.4	87.72	3.5	<b>99.22</b>	27.74	94.15
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.7$ )	17.88	96.53	29.46	93.64	<b>8.18</b>	98.46	51.76	88.8	56.67	87.41	3.46	<b>99.22</b>	27.9	94.01
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.8$ )	18.11	96.57	30.77	93.34	8.12	98.46	55.72	87.43	59.53	86.27	3.59	99.2	29.31	93.54
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.9$ )	<b>16.72</b>	<b>96.98</b>	32.33	93.0	<b>7.19</b>	<b>98.66</b>	62.57	85.02	64.5	84.31	<b>3.16</b>	<b>99.34</b>	31.08	92.88
ResNet-34 (TMM)	GradPCA	61.22	89.1	62.71	<b>87.31</b>	63.45	87.11	<b>73.97</b>	<b>84.25</b>	<b>73.01</b>	<b>83.85</b>	72.3	<b>84.63</b>	67.78	<b>86.04</b>
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.1$ )	59.39	89.48	63.04	87.08	61.03	87.9	75.75	83.04	74.09	82.75	72.8	83.78	67.68	85.67
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.2$ )	56.02	90.24	61.99	<b>87.31</b>	<b>58.14</b>	<b>88.66</b>	75.21	82.89	73.6	82.68	71.52	83.93	66.08	85.95
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.3$ )	<b>55.25</b>	90.44	60.95	87.34	<b>56.99</b>	88.84	74.4	82.84	73.03	82.6	70.88	83.89	65.35	85.99
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.4$ )	<b>55.39</b>	<b>90.49</b>	61.68	87.2	<b>57.09</b>	<b>88.89</b>	75.37	82.58	73.6	82.35	<b>71.34</b>	83.66	65.75	85.86
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.5$ )	<b>55.36</b>	<b>90.3</b>	61.6	87.13	58.36	88.42	74.76	82.98	73.23	82.68	71.45	83.77	65.79	85.88
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.6$ )	58.87	89.75	62.4	86.96	61.99	87.62	74.89	83.2	73.85	82.73	72.53	83.58	67.42	85.64
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.7$ )	61.06	89.13	62.6	87.17	63.43	87.87	74.16	<b>83.28</b>	73.29	82.58	73.7	82.47	68.05	85.99
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.8$ )	61.21	89.1	<b>61.27</b>	<b>87.34</b>	64.81	86.62	<b>70.59</b>	<b>86.4</b>	<b>69.95</b>	<b>85.79</b>	<b>70.24</b>	<b>86.1</b>	66.34	<b>86.98</b>
	GradPCA+DICE ( $p = 0.9$ )	64.9	87.98	63.27	87.06	68.2	85.6	<b>73.69</b>	<b>85.35</b>	<b>72.94</b>	<b>84.75</b>	73.4	<b>84.98</b>	69.4	85.95

Table 8: **CIFAR-100**: Ablation of the parameter  $p$  in GradPCA+DICE.

From Tables 8 and 7, we observe that the optimal choice of the sparsity parameter  $p$  varies significantly across settings. At the same time, sparsification does not lead to substantial performance differences compared to the default GradPCA in most cases. We fix the default value to  $p = 0.8$ , as it provides the greatest benefit on the BiT-M ImageNet benchmark. This value is also close to the DICE-recommended setting of  $p = 0.7$ , which is considered optimal for ImageNet.

### E.4 Ablation: GradPCA-Batch Batch Size

	Methods	SVHN		Places		LSUN-c		LSUN-r		iSUN		Textures		Average	
		FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑	FPR95 ↓	AUROC ↑
BiT-M	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 1000$ )	0.75	<b>99.62</b>	4.0	99.02	3.27	99.22	9.43	98.07	8.13	98.23	<b>0.02</b>	<b>99.99</b>	4.27	99.02
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 2000$ )	0.64	99.7	3.65	99.17	2.68	<b>99.36</b>	8.21	98.35	<b>6.88</b>	98.49	<b>0.02</b>	<b>99.99</b>	3.68	99.18
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 3000$ )	0.53	99.7	3.43	<b>99.21</b>	2.44	99.4	8.01	98.38	7.02	98.52	<b>0.02</b>	99.99	3.57	99.2
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 4000$ )	<b>0.56</b>	<b>99.73</b>	3.31	<b>99.27</b>	2.26	<b>99.45</b>	<b>6.83</b>	<b>98.61</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>98.72</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>99.99</b>	3.13	<b>99.29</b>
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 5000$ )	<b>0.52</b>	<b>99.73</b>	3.2	<b>99.3</b>	2.23	<b>99.45</b>	<b>6.48</b>	<b>98.67</b>	<b>5.55</b>	<b>98.74</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>99.99</b>	3.0	<b>99.31</b>
TMM	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 1000$ )	24.47	<b>96.04</b>	51.05	90.83	26.13	95.79	46.08	92.85	48.3	92.12	47.02	91.81	40.51	93.24
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 2000$ )	24.56	<b>95.99</b>	49.52	90.99	25.4	<b>95.85</b>	44.24	93.05	46.13	92.35	44.98	92.1	39.14	93.39
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 3000$ )	24.43	<b>95.99</b>	48.57	91.1	25.11	<b>95.87</b>	42.16	<b>93.28</b>	44.29	<b>92.58</b>	42.72	<b>92.47</b>	37.88	93.55
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 4000$ )	25.05	95.91	<b>48.14</b>	<b>91.21</b>	<b>24.98</b>	<b>95.91</b>	<b>41.83</b>	<b>93.34</b>	<b>44.11</b>	<b>92.64</b>	<b>42.97</b>	<b>92.51</b>	<b>37.85</b>	<b>93.59</b>
	GradPCA-Batch ( $N = 5000$ )	24.9	<b>95.95</b>	<b>48.65</b>	<b>91.14</b>	<b>25.22</b>	<b>95.87</b>	<b>42.32</b>	<b>93.29</b>	<b>44.41</b>	<b>92.59</b>	<b>43.29</b>	<b>92.46</b>	38.13	<b>93.55</b>

Table 9: **CIFAR-10**: Ablation of batch size  $N$  in GradPCA-Batch.

In this section, we present ablations for the batch size, denoted  $N$ , used in the GradPCA-Batch variant of our method. Computing principal components over a batch requires storing  $N$  gradient vectors, which is not feasible for large parameter spaces or large batch sizes. In addition, performing SVD on the batch NTK matrix of size  $N \times N$  scales poorly with  $N$ , further limiting practicality. As a result, we apply this variant only in the smaller CIFAR-10 benchmark, with results shown in Table 9. Nevertheless, where computationally feasible, GradPCA-Batch can provide additional performance gains.