

# Supplementary Material to ”Conformal Prediction: a Unified Review of Theory and New Challenges”

Matteo Fontana<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup> Gianluca Zeni<sup>1,\*\*</sup> and Simone Vantini<sup>1,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*MOX-Department of Mathematics, Politecnico di Milano, Italy e-mail:*  
<sup>\*\*</sup>[gianluca.zeni@polimi.it](mailto:gianluca.zeni@polimi.it); <sup>†</sup>[simone.vantini@polimi.it](mailto:simone.vantini@polimi.it)

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Management, Economics and Industrial Engineering, Politecnico di Milano, Italy*

<sup>3</sup>*now at European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Ispra, Italy e-mail:*  
<sup>\*</sup>[matteo.fontana@ec.europa.eu](mailto:matteo.fontana@ec.europa.eu)

## 1. Novelty of Conformal Prediction

The problem of prediction sets is well studied in the context of linear regression, where they are usually constructed under linear and Gaussian assumptions. The Gaussian assumption can be relaxed by using, for example, quantile regression. These linear-model-based methods usually have reasonable finite sample performance. However, the coverage is valid only when the regression model is correctly specified. In contrast, non-parametric methods have the potential to work for any smooth distribution, but only asymptotic results are available and the finite sample behaviour remains unclear. To sum up, none of these methods yields prediction bands with distribution-free, finite sample validity. Furthermore, the output is a prediction set in the form of an interval, which may not be optimal to catch the structure of the data (Figure 1). Conformal prediction instead is a general approach to construct valid and distribution-free prediction sets (and sequentially, in the online setting).

There are two other areas in statistics and machine learning that produce some kind of confidence information — a guarantee of the prediction error: the Bayesian framework and the theory of Probably Approximately Correct learning — PAC theory, in short (Valiant, 1984). Specifically, the Bayesian framework is able to complement individual predictions with probabilistic measures of their quality. These measures are, however, based on some a priori assumption about the underlying distribution. Burnaev and Vovk (2014) show that when the (artificial) data set satisfies the prior, the intervals produced are valid, and slightly tighter than the corresponding intervals produced by conformal algorithms. The problem is that for real-world data, the required knowledge is typically not available and as a result, one is forced to assume the existence of some arbitrarily chosen prior. In this case, since the assumed prior is most probably violated, the outputs of Bayesian methods may become quite misleading, due to the loss of validity (Melluish et al., 2001).




FIGURE 1. A comparison between conformal prediction bands, on the left, and quantile regression bands, on the right, for a selected confidence level  $1 - \alpha = 0.9$ . There are clear gaps in the data, indicating that the high density regions of the conditional density of  $Y$  given  $X$  are not connected. The quantile regression approach obscures these features. Source: [Lei and Wasserman \(2014\)](#).

If we measure the efficiency of a prediction interval by its length, we can see that there is a certain dualism between Bayes and conformal prediction intervals: as the Bayesian assumption becomes less and less satisfied, the Bayes prediction intervals lose their validity while maintaining their efficiency, and, on the contrary, the conformal ones lose their efficiency while maintaining their validity. However, validity is more important than efficiency. Hence, if we believe the examples to be generated by a certain model, then we may want to use a nonconformity measure based on a method of prediction that is optimal for that model. This will be efficient if the proposed model is right, but valid in any case. Conformal prediction only assumes exchangeability. In the extreme case, paradoxically, even a function that returns a random nonconformity score (like  $\text{rand}(0, 1)$ ) for all examples will be valid, but the prediction regions will be very wide. The dependence of the validity of prediction intervals on the Bayesian assumption is particularly serious in nonparametric statistics ([Diaconis and Freedman, 1986](#)).

On the other hand, PAC-learning can be applied to an algorithm in order to produce upper bounds on the probability of its error with respect to some confidence level. It only assumes that examples are generated independently by some unknown distribution, but for the resulting bounds to be interesting in practice, the data set must be particularly clean. As this is rarely the case, the bounds are typically very loose and therefore not particularly useful for real-world applications ([Nouretdinov et al., 2001b](#)). In addition, PAC theory has two more drawbacks: the majority of relevant results either involve large explicit constants or do not specify the relevant constants at all; the obtained bounds are for the overall error and not for individual predictions. Nevertheless, there are less theoretical and more effective ways of estimating the confidence in predictions, like the *hold-out* estimates. They are attained by randomly dividing examples in two separate partitions, one that is used for obtaining the prediction model and the other for testing it. The observed rate of errors on the test set

then allows to assess the confidence to have in the prediction rule when new examples are considered. Conformal methods turn out to be a different way of producing hedged predictions.

Aside from the elegance of conformal prediction methods, at least in comparison with the procedure that relies on a hold-out sample, other features constitute important advantages (Vovk et al., 2005). First, there is no rigid separation between learning and prediction, which is the feature of the traditional approaches that makes hedged prediction feasible. Moreover, the hedged predictions produced by conformal algorithms are more accurate, without involving variable transformations or specifying a model. In addition, the confidence with which the label of a new object is predicted is always tailored not only to the previously seen examples but also to that object. Hence, rather than just providing a bound on the prediction error for the entire distribution, it allows to get different bounds for different instances, something which may be very valuable in many practical applications. For instance, in the medical domain, it is clearly more important to be able to evaluate the confidence in predictions related to individual patients instead of groups of patients.

To sum up, in contrast to Bayesian techniques, CP produces well-calibrated outputs as they are only based on the general randomness assumption, and no assumptions *a priori* about the distribution generating the data is needed. Moreover, unlike the PAC theory, they produce confidence measures that are useful in practice and are associated with individual predictions. It should nevertheless be noted that the validity enjoyed by standard conformal predictors is a marginal, and not a conditional one. This represents a possible limitation in the some practical applications of Conformal Methods, that is further addressed in Section 3.1 of the Main Text.

### 1.1. Optimality

The current literature highlights that conformal predictors are essentially the *best* confidence predictors (in the sense we are going to specify), when not the only ones, in a very natural class that satisfy the strong non-asymptotic property of validity. A couple of definitions are required. A confidence predictor  $\gamma^\alpha$  is *invariant* if  $\gamma^\alpha(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \gamma^\alpha(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)})$ , for any permutation  $\pi$  of the indices  $1, \dots, n$ , i.e. it does not depend on the order in which  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  are listed. Under the exchangeability assumption, this is a very natural class of confidence predictors. Later, however, we will also study confidence predictors that are not invariant, such as Mondrian and inductive conformal predictors, respectively in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.2. In second place, given a couple of confidence predictors  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ , we say that  $\gamma_2$  is *at least as good* as  $\gamma_1$  if, for any significance level  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma_2^\alpha(z_1, \dots, z_n) \subseteq \gamma_1^\alpha(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  holds for almost all  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  generated by any exchangeable distribution on  $\mathbf{Z}^n$ . It turns out that any valid invariant confidence predictor is a conformal predictor or can be improved to become a conformal predictor (Vovk et al., 2005, , Theorem 2.6).

**Proposition 1.1.** *Assume  $\mathbf{Z}$  is a Borel space. Let  $\gamma_1$  be an invariant confi-*

dence predictor that is conservatively valid under exchangeability. Then there is a conformal predictor  $\gamma_2$  that is at least as good as  $\gamma_1$ .

## 2. Regression and Approximations

While examining the CP algorithm, the reader may notice that for each possible value  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  (that is, for each potential value  $y$  for the test data point  $Y_{n+1}$ ), we must refit the model  $f$ . Depending on the setting, each run may be fairly expensive — but even disregarding cost, in general we cannot hope to run it infinitely many times, one for each  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ .

In some settings, this problem can be circumvented using specific regularities within the model fitting algorithm (as the RRCM, Section 2.2 of the Main Text). In nearly any other setting, however, we must instead turn to approximations of the full conformal prediction method.

Efficient approximations are available for kernel density estimator, as in [Lei et al. \(2013\)](#), and kernel nonparametric regression ([Lei and Wasserman, 2014](#)). They exploit a result, known as the “sandwich lemma”, which provides a simple characterization of the conformal prediction set in terms of the plug-in estimators of density level set. Indeed, the set predictor, whose analytical form may be intractable, is “sandwiched” by two kernel density level sets, with carefully tuned cut-off parameters, that can be computed quickly and maintain finite sample validity.

Except on these situations, two approaches are available. A straightforward way to approximate the algorithm is to fit it only for a finite set of  $y$  values — for instance, taking a fine grid over some interval  $[a, b]$  that includes the empirical range of the observed response values. That’s exactly how the `conformalInference` R package, developed in [Lei et al. \(2018\)](#), is implemented: in order to compute the conformal confidence predictor at a new covariate vector  $x_{n+1}$ , it scans a set of grid points in the space  $\mathbf{Y}$ . [Chen et al. \(2018\)](#) formalize this rounding procedure, proving that rounding can be done without losing the coverage guarantee of the method. Regarding the range of the grid on which to perform the fitting, it has been traditionally chosen via an empirical approach, while in many applications this specific choice can be extremely delicate and problematic. To our knowledge no studies have addressed this issue, and we would welcome an input on the subject

The second approach, commonly used in the inductive setting, relies instead on the quantiles of the fitted residual distribution. Let  $R_s$  be the  $s$ th smallest value among the nonconformity scores  $R_1, \dots, R_n$ , where  $s = \lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil$ . Actually,  $R_s$  forms a probabilistic bound for the residuals at significance level  $\alpha$ ; that is, with probability  $1-\alpha$ , the nonconformity score of  $x_{n+1}$  will be at most  $R_s$ . The conformal set predictor is then:

$$\Gamma^\alpha(x_{n+1}) = [f(x_{n+1}) - R_s, f(x_{n+1}) + R_s]. \quad (2.1)$$

It is self-evident how, as we improve the estimate of the underlying regression function  $f(x)$ , residuals get smaller, and the resulting prediction interval decreases in length.




FIGURE 2. Updating summaries in online compression models

### 3. Online Compression Models

The idea of conformal prediction can be generalized from learning under randomness, where examples are independent and identically distributed, to *online compression models*. These models include, besides the exchangeability model, the Gaussian model (subsection 3.0.2), the Markov model (Vovk et al. (2005), Chapter 8), and many others.

In an online compression model (OCM), it is assumed that data can be summarized in way that can be updated as new examples show up, and the only probabilities given are backward probabilities — probabilities that explain how the updated summary might have been obtained. It is usually impossible to restore all the statistical information from the OCM’s summary (thus their compression is “lossy”), but it can be argued that the only information lost is noise, and the summary is a sufficient statistic, which store knowledge related to data, useful for predicting future examples, in an efficient way.

In general, an online compression model for an example space  $\mathbf{Z}$  consists of a space  $S$ , whose elements we call *summaries*, and:

- a sequence  $U_1, U_2, \dots$  of updating functions, to bring up to date the summary statistics as new examples come up. At the  $(n + 1)$ th trial, the function  $U_{n+1}$ , given a summary  $\sigma$  and a new example  $z$ , outputs the new summary  $U_{n+1}(\sigma, z)$ ;
- a sequence of one-step kernels  $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots$ . For each summary  $\sigma$ , the kernel  $\rho_n$  defines a joint probability distribution  $\rho_n(\sigma', z | \sigma)$ , for an unknown summary  $\sigma'$  and unknown example  $z$ . It is required that the set of pairs  $(\sigma', z)$  such that  $U_n(\sigma', z) = \sigma$  has probability one.

The intuition behind the concept of OCM is that they are a way of summarizing statistical information. At the beginning we do not have any information, which is represented by the empty summary denoted with  $\square$ . When the first example  $z_1$  arrives, we update our summary to  $\sigma_1 := U_1(\square, z_1)$ , and so on, as depicted in figure 2.

Moreover, we can also define the sequence of summarizing functions  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \dots$  and of full kernels  $P_1, P_2, \dots$ .  $\Sigma_n$  maps a  $n$ -tuple of examples  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  to the summary  $\sigma_n$ , and it can be derived from the updating functions just by composition, while  $P_n$  is equivalent to looking back all the way and so it can be carried out by combining, backwards from  $\sigma_n$ , one-step look-backs. Actually,  $P_n$  is a Markov kernel, of the form  $P_n(z_1, \dots, z_n | \sigma_n)$ . Such a kernel — and that’s the relevant detail — gives probabilities for the different  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  that could have produced  $\sigma_n$ . Usually, online compression models are initially specified in

terms of their summarizing functions  $\Sigma_n$  and their full kernels  $P_n$ , since these are in most of the cases easy to describe.

A more careful look at the exchangeability model is sufficient to identify the general structure of an online compression model. Indeed, we summarize examples simply by omitting information about their ordering; the ordered examples are summarized by a bag containing them. With the notation introduced above,  $\Sigma_n(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \lfloor z_1, \dots, z_n \rfloor$ .

The backward-looking probabilities are equally simple: given the bag, the different possible orderings all have equal probability, as if the ordering resulted from drawing the examples successively at random from the bag without replacement. The probability of the event  $\{z_1 = a_1, \dots, z_n = a_n\}$  is:

$$P_n(a_1, \dots, a_n \mid \sigma_n) = \frac{n_1! \dots n_k!}{n!} \quad \text{if } \lfloor a_1, \dots, a_n \rfloor = \sigma_n, \quad (3.1)$$

and 0 otherwise, where the bag  $\sigma_n$  consists of  $k$  different elements, each with cardinality  $n_j$ . Other OCMs compress more or less drastically but have a similar structure.

As usual, to use conformal prediction, the starting point is a nonconformity measure, which in this case must be a function  $A(\sigma; z)$  such that its value is small if  $z$  seems very similar to the examples that might be summarized by  $\sigma$ , and vice versa. In the base case, without labels (as in Section 2.1 of the Main Text), we have to decide whether to include  $z$  in  $\gamma^\alpha(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  or not. Let  $\tilde{\sigma}_n$  and  $\tilde{z}_{n+1}$  be random variables with a joint probability distribution given by the one-step kernel  $\rho(\cdot, \sigma_{n+1})$ . The p-value  $p_z$  is computed as:

$$p_z := R_{n+1} ( A(\tilde{\sigma}_n, \tilde{z}_{n+1}) \geq A(\sigma_n, z) \mid \sigma_{n+1} ). \quad (3.2)$$

Hence, as always,  $\gamma^\alpha(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \{z : p_z > \alpha\}$ . In the structured case, as presented in Section 2.2 of the Main Text, the algorithm is exactly the same of the base case, once setting  $z = (x_{n+1}, y)$ . Like under the randomness (or exchangeable) assumption, a law of large numbers for backward-looking probabilities holds too, and again we use it to justify confidence in conformal prediction regions. Nevertheless, in this general setting, there is no guarantee any more that conformal prediction regions are optimal.

### 3.0.1. Exchangeability-Within-Label

The first example of OCM we are going to introduce is still connected to the exchangeability assumption, being a relaxation of the hypothesis. Suppose only that the examples of each label are exchangeable with each other — so, the appearance of one label might change the probabilities for the next label. For instance, as in the work of [Riabko \(2005\)](#) aimed at relaxing the randomness assumption in online pattern recognition, consider the problem of hand-written character recognition in a text. The stream of characters is far from exchangeable (we strongly expect to meet “u” after “q”).

However, the model here presented can be close to be correct: different instances of the character “a”, for example, can be almost exchangeable. This means, in more mathematical terms, that being  $a_i, i \in 1, \dots, n$   $n$  instances of the character “a”, sampled from an unknown distribution  $P_a$ , and being  $\sigma$  a finite permutation of the indices  $1, \dots, n$ , the joint probability distribution of  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is equal to the one of  $a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(n)}$ .

As explained in the book of [Vovk et al. \(2005\)](#), chap 8, the exchangeability-within-label model is a Mondrian model, where the category of an example is the label itself. Mondrian models are really interesting when we are willing to assume exchangeability across the categories, because the conformal predictions they produce will always be calibrated within categories.

### 3.0.2. Online Gaussian Linear Model

The *online Gaussian linear model* overlaps the exchangeability model, in the sense that the assumptions for both of the models can hold at the same time, but the assumptions for one of them can hold without the assumptions for the other holding. It is closely related to the classical Gaussian linear model. The strong result we report in the following is that conformal prediction, under these general assumptions, leads to the same prediction regions that are used for the classical model.

Consider examples  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  of the form  $z_i = (x_i, y_i)$ , with the label space being the real line  $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbb{R}$  and the object space being the  $p$ -dimensional Euclidean space,  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{R}^p$ . The OCM here introduced is defined by the sequence of summarizing functions:

$$\Sigma_n = \left( x_1, \dots, x_n, \sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_i, \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 \right) = (X_n, X_n' Y_n, Y_n' Y_n), \quad (3.3)$$

and the full kernel  $P_n(z_1, \dots, z_n \mid \sigma_n)$  is the *uniform* probability distribution over the set of vectors  $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  consistent with the summary  $\sigma_n$ . Let  $\Sigma_n$  be  $(X_n, C, r^2)$ , in short. A vector  $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  is consistent with  $\sigma_n$  if it belongs to  $\Sigma_n^{-1}(\sigma_n) = \Sigma_n^{-1}(X_n, C, r^2)$ , namely if  $\sum_i y_i = C$  and  $\sum_i y_i^2 = r^2$ . This is the intersection of a hyperplane with a sphere, may it be a lower-dimensional sphere or, if they are tangent, a point, and the kernel  $P_n(\cdot \mid \sigma_n)$  distributes all its probability uniformly over it.

The online Gaussian linear model is tightly connected to the classical Gaussian linear model. With the latter we refer to the linear regression statistical model  $y_i = \beta \cdot x_i + \xi_i$ , where  $\beta$  is the constant vector of regression coefficients and  $\xi_i$  are the errors, independent random variables with the same zero-mean normal distribution. Before going on, it is useful to recall the following theoretical result in the classical framework: given an object  $x_{n+1}$ , and computed  $\hat{y}_{n+1}$ , that is the least squares prediction of its label  $y$  based on the previous examples, the interval containing  $y_{n+1}$  with probability  $1 - \alpha$  reads as:

$$\left[ \hat{y}_{n+1} \pm t_{n-p-1, \alpha/2} S_n \sqrt{1 + x_{n+1}' (X_n' X_n)^{-1} x_{n+1}} \right], \quad (3.4)$$

with  $S_n$  the (standard) unbiased estimate of the noise variance. For details, refer to any statistical book.

We are now going to give some results about the (close) relation between the classical and the online models (Shafer and Vovk, 2008). First, if  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  fulfill the assumptions of the classical Gaussian linear model, then they satisfy the assumptions of the online Gaussian linear model. That is, assuming errors  $\xi_i$  to be i.i.d., with mean zero, a common variance and a normal distribution, implies that, conditional on the summary  $\sigma_n$ , i.e. on  $X_n'Y_n = C$  and  $Y_n'Y_n = r^2$ , the vector  $Y$  is distributed uniformly over the sphere defined by  $C$  and  $r^2$ . Second, the assumption of the online Gaussian linear model is sufficient to guarantee that

$$\frac{y_{n+1} - \hat{y}_{n+1}}{S_n \sqrt{1 + x_{n+1}'(X_n'X_n)^{-1}x_{n+1}}} \quad (3.5)$$

has the  $t$ -distribution with  $n-p-1$  degrees of freedom. Third, suppose  $z_1, z_2, \dots$  is an infinite sequence of random variables. Then  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  satisfy the assumptions of the online Gaussian linear model for every integer  $n$  if and only if the joint distribution of  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  is a mixture of distributions given by the classical Gaussian linear model, each model in the mixture possibly having a different  $\beta$  and a different variance for the errors.

Therefore, it can be proved that, when the nonconformal measure is  $A(\sigma, z) = |y - \hat{y}|$ , which is a natural choice, the related conformal prediction region  $\Gamma^\alpha(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1})$  is exactly the classical (3.4)! Moreover, it has to be kept in mind that in the online setting these intervals are valid, in the sense that they are right  $(1 - \alpha)\%$  of the times even though used on accumulating data (Section 2.3 of the Main Text).

#### 4. High-Dimensional Regression

Only a few works in literature deal with prediction sets in high-dimensional regression, where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $p \gg n$ . Current high-dimensional inference methods make strong assumptions while little is known about their robustness against model misspecification. Common approaches in this setting include greedy methods like forward step-wise regression, and  $l_1$ -penalty based methods like the lasso. There is an enormous amount of work dedicated to studying various properties of these methods, but to our knowledge, not the same on set predictors.

In high-dimensional problems, estimators are inevitably more complicated and so the corresponding conformal prediction sets are much harder to characterize. On the other hand, conformal prediction is arguably most useful in such scenarios: model assumptions such as sparsity and low-intrinsic dimensionality are often not true, and the inferential tools developed under such hypotheses are often invalid under model misspecification.

Without any doubt, the most common way to proceed is based on combining the principle of conformal prediction with the  $l_1$ -penalized least squares estimator. Over time, an extensive literature has developed on the topic. Hebiri (2010) describes an approximation of the conformalized lasso estimator — a partial



conformalization indeed. This approximation leads to a big speedup over the original conformal prediction method build on top of the lasso, but loses the key property of conformal inference, the model free coverage guarantee. Recently, [Steinberger and Leeb \(2016\)](#) analyze the jackknife conformal method in the high-dimensional setting, but asymptotic validity is not for free and requires some assumptions on the base estimator (of the regression parameters). Meanwhile, [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#) propose a method which explores a smaller search space. Computational costs are so reduced by a constant fraction, but it still evaluates the prediction set on a grid of points. Lastly, as already mentioned, [Lei \(2019\)](#) develop an algorithm that efficiently and exactly computes the conformal prediction set for the lasso, in an analogous way, to a certain extent, to RRCM (Section 2.2.2 of the Main Text).

More in general, [Lei et al. \(2018\)](#) think that the main way to approach high-dimensional problems lies in the simple, computationally efficient, and yet powerful method that split conformal inference represents. In their work, empirical properties of conformal methods under different simulated data settings are examined — from a simple (linear and classical) setup, to a heteroskedastic and heavy-tailed one, with correlated features. In particular, they compare performances between conformal prediction based on the ordinary linear regression estimator and classical parametric prediction intervals for linear models. Actually, in high-dimensional problems, the full conformal framework used in the paper (i.e. the absolute value of the residual as a NCM, and a regression estimator as the underlying model) outperforms the parametric one in terms of both length and coverage across all settings, due to the poor accuracy of linear regression estimators when  $p$  is large. Even the use of ridge regression does not change things. Moreover, looking at the different implementations of conformal prediction, the split method exhibits a clear computational advantage compared to the full one, guaranteeing similar performance. With such a dramatically reduced computation cost, as already mentioned but even more precious here, adopting split conformal in combination with computationally heavy estimators that involve cross-validation or bootstrap is considered as the best approach.

In the same work, they cast light on an interesting topic, i.e. how conformal inference can help with model-free *variable selection*. The aim is to construct model-free, prediction-based inferential statements about the importance of each covariate in the prediction model for  $Y_{n+1}$  given  $X_{n+1}$ . To do so, they propose a notion of variable importance, called leave-one-covariate-out (or LOCO) inference. A random variable  $\Delta_j$ , for each covariate  $j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , is properly defined to measure the increase in prediction error due to not having access to that covariate in the data set. And consequently inferential statements about variable importance are carried out, based on these variables.

## References

- Bahadur, R. R. and Savage, L. J. (1956). The nonexistence of certain statistical procedures in nonparametric problems. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(4):1115–1122. [MR0084241](#)

- Balasubramanian, V., Ho, S.-S., and Vovk, V. (2014). *Conformal prediction for reliable machine learning: theory, adaptations and applications*. Newnes.
- Barber, R. F., Candes, E. J., Ramdas, A., and Tibshirani, R. J. (2019a). Predictive inference with the jackknife+. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.06019*.
- Barber, R. F., Candes, E. J., Ramdas, A., and Tibshirani, R. J. (2019a). Conformal prediction under covariate shift. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.06019*.
- Barber, R. F., Candes, E. J., Ramdas, A., and Tibshirani, R. J. (2019). The limits of distribution-free conditional predictive inference. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 10(2):455–482
- Burnaev, E. and Vovk, V. (2014). Efficiency of conformalized ridge regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 605–622.
- Capuccini, M., Carlsson, L., Norinder, U., and Spjuth, O. (2015). Conformal prediction in Spark: large-scale machine learning with confidence. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Symposium on Big Data Computing (BDC)*, pages 61–67. IEEE.
- Carlsson, L., Ahlberg, E., Boström, H., Johansson, U., and Linusson, H. (2015). Modifications to p-values of conformal predictors. In *International Symposium on Statistical Learning and Data Sciences*, pages 251–259. Springer.
- Chen, W., Chun, K.-J., and Barber, R. F. (2018). Discretized conformal prediction for efficient distribution-free inference. *Stat*, 7(1):e173. [MR3769053](#)
- Chen, W., Wang, Z., Ha, W., and Barber, R. F. (2016). Trimmed conformal prediction for high-dimensional models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09933*.
- Chen, X., Monfort, M., Liu, A., and Ziebart, B. D. (2016b). Robust covariate shift regression. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1270–1279.
- Chernozhukov, V., Wuthrich, K., and Zhu, Y. (2018) Exact and robust conformal inference methods for predictive machine learning with dependent data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.06300*.
- Dashevskiy, M., and Luo, Z. (2011). Time series prediction with performance guarantee. *IET communications*, 5(8):1044–1051.
- Devetyarov, D. and Nouretdinov, I. (2010). Prediction with confidence based on a random forest classifier. In *IFIP International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations*, pages 37–44. Springer.
- Diaconis, P. and Freedman, D. (1986). On the consistency of Bayes estimates. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1–26. [MR0829555](#)
- Diquigiovanni, J., Fontana, M., and Vantini, S. (2021) Conformal Prediction Bands for Multivariate Functional Data *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, in press
- Diquigiovanni, J., Fontana, M., and Vantini, S. (2021) The Importance of Being a Band: Finite-Sample Exact Distribution-Free Prediction Sets for Functional Data *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.06746*.
- Diquigiovanni, J., Fontana, M., and Vantini, S. (2021) Distribution-Free Prediction Bands for Multivariate Functional Time Series: an Application to the Italian Gas Market *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00527*.
- Donoho, D. L. (1988). One-sided inference about functionals of a density. *The Annals of Statistics*, 16(4):1390–1420. [MR0964930](#)
- Dunn, R. and Wasserman, L. (2018). Distribution-free prediction sets with

- random effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.07441*.
- Gammerman, A., Vovk, V., and Vapnik, V. (1998). Learning by transduction. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 148–155. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Hebiri, M. (2010). Sparse conformal predictors. *Statistics and Computing*, 20(2):253–266. [MR2610776](#)
- Hewitt, E. and Savage, L.J. (1955). Symmetric measures on cartesian products. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 80(2):470–501. [MR0076206](#)
- Ho, S.-S. and Wechsler, H. (2004). Learning from data streams via online transduction. *Ma et al*, pages 45–52.
- Johansson, U., Ahlberg, E., Boström, H., Carlsson, L., Linusson, H., and Sönströd, C. (2015). Handling small calibration sets in Mondrian inductive conformal regressors. In *International Symposium on Statistical Learning and Data Sciences*, pages 271–280. Springer.
- Johansson, U., Boström, H., Löfström, T., and Linusson, H. (2014). Regression conformal prediction with random forests. *Machine Learning*, 97(1-2):155–176. [MR3252831](#)
- Lambrou, A., Nouretdinov, I., and Papadopoulos, H. (2015). Inductive Venn prediction. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 74(1-2):181–201. [MR3353902](#)
- Lambrou, A., Papadopoulos, H., Nouretdinov, I., and Gammerman, A. (2012). Reliable probability estimates based on support vector machines for large multiclass datasets. In *IFIP International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations*, pages 182–191. Springer.
- Lei, J. (2019). Fast exact conformalization of lasso using piecewise linear homotopy. *Biometrika*, 106(4):749–764.
- Lei, J., G’Sell, M., Rinaldo, A., Tibshirani, R. J. and Wasserman, L. (2018). Distribution-free predictive inference for regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1094–1111. [MR3862342](#)
- Lei, J., Rinaldo, A., and Wasserman, L. (2015). A conformal prediction approach to explore functional data. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 74(1-2):29–43. [MR3353895](#)
- Lei, J., Robins, J., and Wasserman, L. (2013). Distribution-free prediction sets. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(501):278–287. [MR3174619](#)
- Lei, J. and Wasserman, L. (2014). Distribution-free prediction bands for non-parametric regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(1):71–96. [MR3153934](#)
- Linusson, H., Norinder, U., Boström, H., Johansson, U., and Löfström, T. (2014). On the Calibration of Aggregated Conformal Predictors. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 60:261–270.
- Linusson, H., Johansson, U., Boström, H., and Löfström, T. (2014). Efficiency comparison of unstable transductive and inductive conformal classifiers. In *IFIP International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations*, pages 261–270. Springer.

- Medarametla D., Candès E.J.(2021). Distribution-Free Conditional Median Inference *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2): 4625-4658.
- Melluish, T., Saunders, C., Nourtdinov, I., and Vovk, V. (2001). Comparing the Bayes and typicalness frameworks. In *European Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 360–371. Springer.
- Melluish, T., Vovk, V., and Gammerman, A. (1999). Transduction for regression estimation with confidence. In *Neural information processing systems, NIPS'99*.
- Nourtdinov, I., Melluish, T., and Vovk, V. (2001a). Ridge regression confidence machine. In *ICML*, pages 385–392.
- Nourtdinov, I., Gammerman, J., Fontana, M. and Rehal, D. (2020). Multi-level conformal clustering: A distribution-free technique for clustering and anomaly detection. *Neurocomputing*, 397:279–291.
- Nourtdinov, I., Volkhonskiy, D., Lim, P., Toccaceli, P., and Gammerman, A. (2018). Inductive Venn-Abers predictive distribution. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 91:1–22.
- Nourtdinov, I. and Vovk, V. (2006). Criterion of calibration for transductive confidence machine with limited feedback. *Theoretical computer science*, 364(1):3–9. [MR2268298](#)
- Nourtdinov, I., Vovk, V., Vyugin, M., and Gammerman, A. (2001b). Pattern recognition and density estimation under the general iid assumption. In *International Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 337–353. Springer.
- Papadopoulos, H. (2008). Inductive conformal prediction: Theory and application to neural networks. In *Tools in artificial intelligence*. InTech.
- Papadopoulos, H., Gammerman, A., and Vovk, V. (2008). Normalized nonconformity measures for regression conformal prediction. In *Proceedings of the IASTED International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications (AIA 2008)*, pages 64–69.
- Papadopoulos, H. and Haralambous, H. (2010). Neural networks regression inductive conformal predictor and its application to total electron content prediction. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 32–41. Springer.
- Papadopoulos, H. and Haralambous, H. (2011). Reliable prediction intervals with regression neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 24(8):842–851.
- Papadopoulos, H., Proedrou, K., Vovk, V., and Gammerman, A. (2002a). Inductive confidence machines for regression. In *European Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 345–356. Springer. [MR2050303](#)
- Papadopoulos, H., Vovk, V., and Gammerman, A. (2002b). Qualified prediction for large data sets in the case of pattern recognition. In *ICMLA*, pages 159–163. [MR2805257](#)
- Papadopoulos, H., Vovk, V., and Gammerman, A. (2011). Regression conformal prediction with nearest neighbours. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 40:815–840.
- Ramsay, J. and Silverman, B. (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer. [MR1889966](#)

- Romano Y., Patterson E., Candès E.J. (2019). Conformalized Quantile Regression *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.03222*.
- Riabko, D. (2005). *On the flexibility of theoretical models for pattern recognition*. PhD thesis, Citeseer.
- Ryabko, D., Vovk, V., and Gammerman, A. (2003). Online region prediction with real teachers. *Submitted for publication. Criterion of Calibration for Transductive Confidence Machine*, 267.
- Saunders, C., Gammerman, A., and Vovk, V. (1999). Transduction with confidence and credibility. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 2, pages 722–726.
- Saunders, C., Gammerman, A., and Vovk, V. (2000). Computationally efficient transductive machines. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 325–337. Springer.
- Shafer, G. and Vovk, V. (2008). A tutorial on conformal prediction. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:371–421. [MR2417240](#)
- Shen, J., Liu, R. Y., and Xie, M.-g. (2018). Prediction with confidence - a general framework for predictive inference. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 195:126–140. [MR3760843](#)
- Shimodaira, H. (2000). Improving predictive inference under covariate shift by weighting the log-likelihood function. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 90(2):227–244. [MR1795598](#)
- Steinberger, L. and Leeb, H. (2016). Leave-one-out prediction intervals in linear regression models with many variables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.05801*.
- Steinberger, L. and Leeb, H. (2018). Conditional predictive inference for high-dimensional stable algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.01412*.
- Valiant, L. G. (1984). A theory of the learnable. *Communications of the ACM*, 27(11):1134–1142.
- Vapnik, V. (1998). *Statistical Learning Theory*. Wiley, New York.
- Ramsay, J. and Silverman, B. (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*. [MR1889966](#)
- Vovk, V. (2002). Online confidence machines are well-calibrated. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings. The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 187–196. IEEE.
- Vovk, V. (2012). Conditional validity of inductive conformal predictors. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 475–490. [MR3080332](#)
- Vovk, V. (2013). Transductive conformal predictors. In *IFIP International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations*, pages 348–360. Springer.
- Vovk, V. (2015). Cross-conformal predictors. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 74(1-2):9–28. [MR3353894](#)
- Vovk, V., Fedorova, V., Nouretdinov, I., and Gammerman, A. (2016). Criteria of efficiency for conformal prediction. In *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction with Applications*, pages 23–39. Springer International Publishing.
- Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. (2005). *Algorithmic Learning in a Random World*. Springer. [MR2161220](#)
- Vovk, V., Lindsay, D., Nouretdinov, I., and Gammerman, A. (2003). Mondrian

- confidence machine. *Technical Report*.
- Vovk, V., Nouretdinov, I., Gammerman, A., et al. (2009). Online predictive linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(3):1566–1590. [MR2509084](#)
- Vovk, V., Nouretdinov, I., Manokhin, V., and Gammerman, A. (2018). Cross-conformal predictive distributions. In *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction and Applications*, pages 37–51.
- Vovk, V., Shafer, G., and Nouretdinov, I. (2004). Self-calibrating probability forecasting. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1133–1140.
- Vovk, V., Shen, J., Manokhin, V., and Xie, M. (2017). Nonparametric predictive distributions based on conformal prediction. *Machine Learning*, pages 1–30. [MR3917055](#)
- Wang, D., Wang, P., and Shi, J. (2018). A fast and efficient conformal regressor with regularized extreme learning machine. *Neurocomputing*, 304:1–11.