1. **Title:** Outliers: obligations and opportunities
2. **Corresponding Author:** David Linnard Wheeler1,2

**Affiliations:**

1 University of California, Berkeley, School of Information, Berkeley, CA

2 Washington State University, Department of Plant Pathology, Pullman, WA

1. **Keywords:** outliers, anomalies, value-laden judgements, ethics
2. **Executive summary**

Data scientists are often confronted with decisions about how to define, detect, ascribe provenance, and ultimately treat outlying observations. Here I argue that these decisions require value-laden judgements. To motivate this topic, I first expose the pernicious consequences that can arise from these decisions with historical examples.

The forces that animate these decisions about outliers are a special case of a more fundamental problem first identified by philosophers - that reality is how it appears.

Further, I describe how systematic outlier omission might snowball and stifle scientific advancements by suppression of anomalies - the things that Thomas Kuhn argued often precipitate paradigms shifts.

Finally, I summarize cases where inclusion and exclusion of outliers from data sets can introduce biases and conflicts between our fiduciary and moral responsibilities. From these premises, I argue that confrontation with outliers can challenge ethical principles that are not always obvious and demand critical examination, caution, and actions that may be at odds with near-term analytical duties. It is therefore incumbent upon us to be explicit about the value-laden decisions we use to navigate encounters with outliers and balance both analytical and moral obligations. To satisfy these responsibilities, recommendations are offered.
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