

# Unsupervised Layer-wise Score Aggregation for Textual OOD Detection

Maxime DARRIN<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Guillaume STAERMAN<sup>4,6,7</sup> Eduardo DC GOMEZ<sup>4,5,6,7</sup>  
Jackie CK CHEUNG<sup>2,3,8</sup> Pablo PIANTANIDA<sup>1,2,4,6</sup> Pierre COLOMBO<sup>4,7,10,11</sup>

<sup>1</sup>International Laboratory on Learning Systems, <sup>2</sup>MILA - Quebec AI Institute, <sup>3</sup>McGill University  
<sup>4</sup>Université Paris-Saclay, <sup>5</sup>Laboratoire signaux et systèmes, <sup>6</sup>CNRS, <sup>7</sup>CentraleSupélec  
<sup>8</sup>Canada CIFAR AI Chair, Mila, <sup>9</sup>INRIA, CEA, Paris, <sup>10</sup>Equal, Paris, <sup>11</sup>MICS

## Abstract

Out-of-distribution (OOD) detection is a rapidly growing field due to new robustness and security requirements driven by an increased number of AI-based systems. Existing OOD textual detectors often rely on anomaly scores (*e.g.*, Mahalanobis distance) computed on the embedding output of the last layer of the encoder. In this work, we observe that OOD detection performance varies greatly depending on the task and layer output. More importantly, we show that the usual choice (the last layer) is rarely the best one for OOD detection and that far better results can be achieved, provided that an oracle selects the best layer. We propose a data-driven, unsupervised method to leverage this observation to combine layer-wise anomaly scores. In addition, we extend classical textual OOD benchmarks by including classification tasks with a more significant number of classes (up to 150), which reflects more realistic settings. On this augmented benchmark, we show that the proposed post-aggregation methods achieve robust and consistent results comparable to using the best layer according to an oracle while removing manual feature selection altogether.

## 1 Introduction

With the increasing deployment of ML tools and systems, the issue of their safety and robustness is becoming more and more critical. Out-of-distribution robustness and detection have emerged as an important research direction (Yang et al. 2021; Liu et al. 2020; Winkens et al. 2020a; Hendrycks and Gimpel 2016; Serrà et al. 2019; Hendrycks et al. 2021; McAllister et al. 2019). These OOD samples can cause the deployed AI system to fail as neural models rely heavily on previously seen concepts or patterns (Jakubovitz, Giryes, and Rodrigues 2019) and tend to struggle with anomalous samples (Berend et al. 2020; Bulusu et al. 2020) or new concepts. These failures can affect user confidence, or even rule out the adoption of AI in critical applications.

Distinguishing OOD samples (OUT) from in-distribution (IN) samples is a challenge when working on complex data structures (*e.g.*, text or image) due to their high dimensionality. Although OOD detection has attracted much attention in computer vision (Huang et al. 2022; Wang et al. 2022c; Fang et al. 2022), few studies focused on textual data. Furthermore, distortion and perturbation methods for sensitivity

analysis used in computer vision are not suitable due to the discrete nature of text (Lee, Prabhushankar, and AlRegib 2022; Schwinn et al. 2021).

A fruitful line of research (Lee et al. 2018; Liang, Li, and Srikant 2018; Esmailpour et al. 2022; Xu et al. 2020; Huang et al. 2020) focuses on adding simple filtering methods on top of pre-trained models without requiring retraining the model. They include plug-in detectors that rely on softmax-based- or hidden-layer-based- confidence scores (Lee et al. 2018; Liang, Li, and Srikant 2018; Esmailpour et al. 2022; Xu et al. 2020; Huang et al. 2020). Softmax-based detectors (Liu et al. 2020; Pearce, Brintrup, and Zhu 2021; Techapanurak, Suganuma, and Okatani 2019) rely on the predicted probabilities to decide whether a sample is OOD. In contrast, hidden-layer-based scores (*e.g.*, cosine similarity, data-depth (Colombo et al. 2022), or Mahalanobis distance (Lee et al. 2018)) rely on input embedding of the model encoder. In computer vision and more recently in natural language processing, these methods arbitrarily rely on either the embedding generated by the last layer of encoder (Podolskiy et al. 2021) or on the logits (Wang et al. 2022a; Khalid et al. 2022) to compute anomaly scores. While Softmax-based detectors can be applied in black-box scenarios, where one can only access the model’s output, they have a very narrow view of the model’s behaviour. In contrast, hidden-layer-based methods enable one to get deeper insights. They tend to yield better performance at the cost of memory and compute overhead.

We argue that the choice of the penultimate layers (*i.e.*, the last layer, or the logits) ignores the multi-layer nature of the encoder and should be questioned. We give evidence that these representations are (i) not always the best choices (see Fig. 1) and (ii) that leveraging information from all layers can be beneficial. We introduce a data-driven procedure to exploit the information extracted from existing OOD scores across all the different layers of the encoder.

### Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

**1. We introduce a new paradigm.** Previous methods rely on a manual selection of the layer to be used, which ignores the information in the other layers of the encoder. We propose an automatic approach to aggregate information from all hidden layers without human (supervised) intervention. *Our method does not require access to OOD samples and harnesses information available in all model layers by leveraging principled anomaly detection tools.*

**2. We conduct extensive experiments on our newly proposed benchmark:** We introduce MILTOOD-C A **Multilingual Text OOD** detection benchmark for **Classification** tasks. MILTOOD-C alleviates two main limitations of previous works: (i) contrary to previous work that relies on datasets involving a limited number of classes (up to 5), MILTOOD-C includes datasets with a higher number of classes (up to 150 classes); (ii) MILTOOD-C goes beyond the English-centric setting and includes French, Spanish, and German datasets. Our experiments involve four models and over 186 pairs of IN and OUT datasets, which show that our new aggregation procedures achieve high performance. At the same time, previous methods tend to suffer a drop in performance in these more realistic scenarios.

## 2 OOD detection for text classification

### 2.1 Background and notations

We adopt a text classification setting and rely on the encoder section of a model. Let  $\Omega$  be a vocabulary and  $\Omega^*$  its Kleene closure<sup>1</sup>. We consider  $(X, Y)$  a random variable with values in  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  such that  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \Omega^*$  is the textual input space, and  $P_{XY}$  is its joint probability distribution. The set  $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, C\}$  represents the classes of a classification task and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) = \left\{ \mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{Y}|} : \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} p_i = 1 \right\}$  the probability simplex over the classes. It is assumed that we have access to a training set  $\mathcal{D}_N = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  composed of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) realizations of  $P_{XY}$ . The Out-Of-Distribution (OOD) detection problem consists of deciding whether a new, previously unseen sample comes (or not) from the IN distribution  $P_{XY}$ . The goal is to build a binary function  $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  based on the thresholding of an anomaly score  $s : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  that separates IN samples from OOD samples. Namely, for a threshold  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we have:

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \gamma) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s(\mathbf{x}) > \gamma, \\ 0 & \text{if } s(\mathbf{x}) \leq \gamma. \end{cases}$$

### 2.2 Building an OOD detector

We assume that we have given a classifier  $f_\theta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ :

$$f_\theta = \text{softmax} \circ h \circ f_L^\theta \circ f_{L-1}^\theta \circ \dots \circ f_1^\theta, \quad (1)$$

with  $L > 1$  layers<sup>2</sup>, where  $f_\ell : \mathbb{R}^{d_{\ell-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\ell}$  is the  $\ell$ -th layer of the encoder with  $d_\ell$  being the dimension of the latent space after the  $\ell$ -th layer ( $d_0 = d$ ). It is worth noting that in the case of transformers (Vaswani et al. 2017), all latent spaces have the same dimension. Finally,  $h$  represents the logit function of the classifier.

To compute the anomaly score  $s$  from  $f_\theta$ , OOD approaches rely on the hidden representations of the (multi-layer) encoder. For  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  an input sequence, we denote  $\mathbf{z}_\ell = (f_\ell \circ \dots \circ f_1)(\mathbf{x})$  its latent representation at layer  $\ell$ . The

<sup>1</sup>The Kleene closure corresponds to sequences of arbitrary size written with words in  $\Omega$ . Formally:  $\Omega^* = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \Omega^i$ .

<sup>2</sup>For the sake of brevity, we omit the parameters  $\theta$  in the following.

latent representation obtained after the  $\ell$ -th layer of the training set is denoted as  $\mathcal{D}_N^\ell = \{(\mathbf{z}_{\ell,i}, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ . Furthermore, we denote by  $\mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y}$  the restriction of  $\mathcal{D}_N^\ell$  to the samples with label  $y$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y} = \{(\mathbf{z}_{\ell,i}, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_N^\ell : y_i = y\}$  with  $N_y = |\mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y}|$  indicates the cardinal of this set.

Feature-based OOD detectors usually rely on three key elements:

- (i) **Selecting features:** the layer  $\ell$  whose representation is considered to be the input of the anomaly score.
- (ii) **A notion of an anomaly (or novelty) score** built on the mapping  $\mathcal{D}_N^\ell$  of the training set on the chosen feature space. We can build such a score  $s(\cdot, \mathcal{D}_N^\ell)$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$  for any notion of abnormality.
- (iii) **Setting a threshold** to build the final decision function.

**Remark 1. Choice of the threshold.** To select  $\gamma$ , we follow previous work (Colombo et al. 2022; Picot et al. 2023) by choosing a number of training samples (i.e., “outliers”) the detector can wrongfully detect. A classical choice is to set this proportion to 95%.

### 2.3 Popular Anomaly Scores

In what follows, we present three common anomaly scores for step (ii) of the previously mentioned procedure.

**Mahalanobis distance.** Authors of Lee et al. (2018) (see also (Podolskiy et al. 2021)) propose to compute the Mahalanobis distance on the abstract representations of each layer and each class. Precisely, this distance is given by:

$$s_M(\mathbf{z}_\ell, \mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y}) = (\mathbf{z}_\ell - \mu_{\ell,y})^\top \Sigma_{\ell,y}^{-1} (\mathbf{z}_\ell - \mu_{\ell,y})$$

on each layer  $\ell$  and each class  $y$  where  $\mu_{\ell,y}$  and  $\Sigma_{\ell,y}$  are the estimated class-conditional mean and covariance matrix computed on  $\mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y}$ , respectively. The final score from Lee et al. (2018) is obtained by choosing the minimum of these scores over the classes on the penultimate encoder layer.

**Integrated Rank-Weighted depth.** Colombo et al. (2022) propose to leverage the Integrated Rank-Weighted (IRW) depth (Ramsay, Durocher, and Leblanc 2019; Staerman, Mozharovskiy, and Cl  men  on 2021). Similar to the Mahalanobis distance, the IRW data depth measures the centrality/distance of a point to a point cloud. For the  $\ell$ -th layer, an approximation of the IRW depth can be defined as:

$$s_{\text{IRW}}(\mathbf{z}_\ell, \mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y}) = \frac{1}{n_{\text{proj}}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{proj}}} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{N_y} \mathbb{1}\{g_{k,i}(\mathbf{z}_\ell) \leq 0\}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{N_y} \mathbb{1}\{g_{k,i}(\mathbf{z}_\ell) > 0\} \right\},$$

where  $g_{k,i}(\mathbf{z}_\ell) = \langle u_k, \mathbf{z}_{\ell,i} - \mathbf{z}_\ell \rangle$ ,  $u_k \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_{\ell,i} \in \mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y}$  where  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| = 1\}$  is the unit hypersphere and  $n_{\text{proj}}$  is the number of directions sampled on the sphere.

**Cosine similarity.** Zhou, Liu, and Chen (2021) propose to compute the maximum cosine similarity between the embedded sample  $\mathbf{z}_\ell$  and the training set  $\mathcal{D}_N^\ell$  at layer  $\ell$ :

$$s_C(\mathbf{z}_\ell, \mathcal{D}_N^\ell) = - \max_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell,i} \in \mathcal{D}_N^\ell} \frac{\langle \mathbf{z}_\ell, \mathbf{z}_{\ell,i} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{z}_\ell\| \|\mathbf{z}_{\ell,i}\|},$$




Figure 1: OOD detection performance in terms of AUROC  $\uparrow$  for each features-based OOD score (Mahalanobis distance ( $s_M$ ), Maximum cosine similarity ( $s_C$ ) and IRW ( $s_{IRW}$ )) computed at each layer of the encoder for different OOD datasets for a model fine-tuned on SST2. We observe that the performance of each metric on each layer varies significantly with the OOD task and that OOD detection based on the last layer (dark dotted line) rarely yields the best results.

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  denote the Euclidean inner product and norm, respectively. They also choose the penultimate layer. It is worth noting they do not rely on a per-class decision.

## 2.4 Related works and limitations

We claim that the choice of layer is crucial in textual OOD detection; we report in Fig. 1 the OOD performance of popular detectors described in Sec. 2.3, applied at each layer of the encoder. We observe a high variability across different layers. The last layer is rarely the best-performing layer, and there is room for improvement if we could choose the best possible layer or gather useful information from all of them. This observation is consistent with the literature, as neural networks are known to extract different information and construct different abstractions at each layer (Ilin, Watson, and Kozma 2017; Kozma, Ilin, and Siegelmann 2018; Dara and Tumma 2018).

**Works relying on a manually selected layer.** The choice of layer for step (i) in Sec. 2.2 is not usually a question. Most work arbitrarily relies on the logits (Liang, Li, and Srikant 2018; Liu et al. 2020) or the last layer of the encoder (Winkens et al. 2020b; Podolskiy et al. 2021; Sun et al. 2022; Ren et al. 2019; Gomes et al. 2022; Yang et al. 2021; Hendrycks and Gimpel 2016; Wang et al. 2022a). We argue that these choices are unjustified and that previous work gives up on important information in the other layers.

**Works that feature layer aggregation.** Besides Colombo et al., which proposes to aggregate the features instead of aggregating the OOD scores as we do, we are unaware of any other work suggesting layer aggregation for textual OOD detection. There, however, exist several adjacent works in computer vision. Abdelzad et al. proposes a method which starts by finding the best layer for OOD detection for a validation set and uses that layer afterwards. Still, there is no adaptation for different datasets. Other works such as Lin, Roy, and Li; Ballas and Diou focus on training models with specific architectures (for computer vision) to leverage early-stage exit or different information from different layers to detect OOD samples or improve generalization on OOD samples. In

addition, these works rely on image-specific properties that do not translate well in text (lossy compression for example). More closely related work are Wang et al.; Lee et al.. The first proposes to compute OOD scores at each layer (1-SVM), and they select the layer that yields the highest confidence in terms of margin. However, their work features a single OOD score and a single aggregation method in computer vision. In contrast, we propose a more general framework and systematically evaluate different OOD scores and aggregation procedures. The second proposes to learn a linear combination of Mahalanobis scores but does not explore OOD score aggregation or layer selection systematically. In addition, both of these works have been proposed in computer vision and show that aggregation does not lead to significant improvements. This dramatically contrasts with our findings in textual models, consistent with the literature (Picot et al. 2023; Raghuram et al. 2021).

We propose to compute standard OOD scores on each layer of the encoder (and not only on the logits or the representation generated by the last layer) and to aggregate this score in an unsupervised fashion to select and combine the most relevant following the task at hand.

## 3 Leveraging information from all layers

In this section, we describe our aggregation methods that use the information available in the different layers of the encoder.

### 3.1 Problem Statement

For an input  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  and a training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_N$ , we obtain their set of embedding representation sets:  $\{\mathbf{z}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$  and  $\{\mathcal{D}_N^\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$ , respectively. Given an anomaly score function  $s : \mathbb{R}^d \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (e.g., those described in Sec. 2.3), we define the OOD score set of an input  $\mathbf{x}$  as  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N) = \{s(\mathbf{z}_\ell; \mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y})\}_{\ell=1}^L\}_{y=1}^C \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times C}$ . Similarly, it is possible to obtain a reference set of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \{\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N), \forall (\mathbf{x}, y) \in$

$\mathcal{D}_N\}$  from the training data<sup>3</sup>. In what follows, we aim to answer the following question.

*Can we leverage all the information available in  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N)$  and/or  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}_N)$  to build an OOD detector?*

### 3.2 Proposed Framework

Our framework aims at comparing the set of scores of a sample to the sets of scores of a reference relying on principled anomaly detection algorithms.

The goal of this work is to propose a data-driven aggregation method of OOD scores<sup>4</sup>,  $\text{Agg}$ .  $\text{Agg}$  is defined as:

$$\text{Agg} : \mathbb{R}^{L \times C} \times (\mathbb{R}^{L \times C})^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N), \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}_N)) \rightarrow \text{Agg}(\mathcal{S}_s, \mathcal{R}),$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  denotes the input sample.

**Intuition.** This framework allows us to consider the whole trace of a sample through the model. This formulation has two main advantages: it avoids manual layer selection and enables us to leverage information from all the encoder layers.

We propose two families of approaches: (i) one solely relies on the score set  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N)$  (corresponding to a no-reference scenario and denoted as  $\text{Agg}_{\emptyset}$ ) and (ii) the second one (named reference scenario) leverages the reference set  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ .

**Remark 2.** *It is worth noting that our framework through  $\text{Agg}_{\emptyset_{set}}$  or  $\text{Agg}$  naturally includes previous approaches (Lee et al. 2018; Zhou, Liu, and Chen 2021; Colombo et al. 2022). For example, the detector of Lee et al. (2018) can be obtained by defining  $\text{Agg}_{\emptyset}$  as the minimum of the penultimate line of the matrix  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}_N)$ .*

### 3.3 Detailed Aggregation Procedures

**Intuition.** Our framework through  $\text{Agg}$  and  $\text{Agg}_{\emptyset}$  requires two types of operations to extract a single score from  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{D}_N)$  and  $\mathcal{R}_s(\mathcal{D}_N)$ : one aggregation operation over the layers and one aggregation operation over the classes, where necessary.

**Our framework in a nutshell.** We assume we are given an anomaly score,  $s$ , that we want to enhance by leveraging all the layers of the encoder. For a given input  $\mathbf{x}$ , our framework follows 4 steps (see Fig. 2 for a depiction of the procedure):

1. Compute the embeddings  $\{\mathbf{z}_l\}_{l=1}^L$  for  $\mathbf{x}$  and every element of  $\mathcal{D}_N$ .
2. Form  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}_N)$  using the score  $s$ .
3. Perform  $\text{Agg}_{\emptyset}$  or  $\text{Agg}$ :
- (a) (*per layer*) Aggregate score information over the layers to obtain a vector composed of  $C$  scores.
- (b) (*per class*) Take the minimum value of this vector.
4. Apply a threshold  $\gamma$  on that value.

Step (3.b.) is inspired by the OOD literature (Lee et al. 2018; Colombo et al. 2022). It relies on the observation that if the input sample is IN-distribution, it is expected to have

<sup>3</sup>When using the cosine similarity, which does not rely on a per-class decision,  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N)$  is reduced to  $\{s(\mathbf{z}_\ell; \mathcal{D}_N^\ell)\}_{\ell=1}^L$ .

<sup>4</sup>We do not assume that we have access to OOD samples as they are often not available.

at least one low score in the class vector, whereas an OOD sample should only have high scores equivalent to a high minimum score.

**No-reference scenario ( $\text{Agg}_{\emptyset}$ )** In the no-reference scenario, we have access to a limited amount of information. We thus propose to rely on simple statistics to aggregate the OOD scores available in  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N)$  to compute step (3.) of the proposed procedure. Precisely, we use the *average*, the minimum (*min*), the median (*med*), and *coordinate* (see Remark 2) operators on the column of the matrix  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N)$ .

**Data-driven scenario ( $\text{Agg}$ )** In the data-driven scenario,  $\text{Agg}$  also has access to the set of reference OOD scores (*i.e.*,  $\mathcal{R}_s(\mathcal{D}_N)$ ) for the given OOD score  $s$ . The goal, then, is to compare the score set  $\mathcal{S}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{D}_N)$  of the input with this reference set  $\mathcal{R}_s(\mathcal{D}_N)$  to obtain a score vector of size  $C$ . *In the following, we propose an original solution for the layer operation.*

For the *per layer* operation we rely on an anomaly detection algorithm for each class  $\mathcal{A}_y$  defined as:

$$\mathcal{A}_y : \mathbb{R}^L \times (\mathbb{R}^L)^{N_y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \mathbf{s}_y \times \mathcal{R}_y \mapsto \mathcal{A}_y(\mathbf{s}_y, \mathcal{R}_y), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}_y = \{s(\mathbf{z}_\ell; \mathcal{D}_N^{\ell,y})\}_{\ell=1}^L$  and  $\mathcal{R}_y = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}_N^y)$ .

**Remark 3.**  *$\mathcal{A}_y$  is trained on the reference set  $\mathcal{R}_y$  for each class and thus does not involve any OOD samples. The score returned for a vector  $\mathbf{s}_y$  is the prediction score associated with the trained algorithm.*

**Remark 4.** *We define a per-class decision for  $\text{Agg}$  since it has been shown to be significantly more effective than global scores (Huang and Li 2021). It is the approach chosen by most state-of-the-art-methods. We have validated this approach by conducting extensive experiments. We refer the reader to Sec. C for further discussion.*

We propose several popular anomaly detection algorithms. First, we offer to reuse common OOD scores ( $s_M, s_C, s_{IRW}$ ) as aggregation methods(see Sec. C for more details): they are now trained on the reference set of sets of OOD scores  $\mathcal{R}_s(\mathcal{D}_N)$  and provide a notion of anomaly for the trace of a sample through the model. We also compute the median and average score as natural baselines for the aggregation setting. In addition, we propose more elaborate anomaly detection algorithms such as Isolation Forest (IF) (Liu, Ting, and Zhou 2008) and the Local Outlier Factor (LOF) (Breunig et al. 2000). Below, we briefly recall the general insights of each of these algorithms. It is important to emphasize that our framework can accommodate any anomaly detection algorithms (further details are given in Sec. C, and in Sec. D, we provide a discussion about the computational overhead of the different methods).

**Local Outlier Factor.** This method compares a sample’s density with its neighbours’ density. Any sample with a lower density than its neighbours is regarded as an outlier.

**Isolation Forest.** This popular algorithm is built on the idea that anomalous instances should be easily distinguished from normal instances. It leads to a score that measures the complexity of separating a sample from others based on the number of necessary decision trees required to isolate a data point.




Figure 2: Schema of our aggregation procedure. (1) We extract the embeddings at each layer of the encoder for every sample. (2) We compute the per-class scores for a reference set and the new sample to be evaluated for each layer embedding. (3) We aggregate the scores over every layer to get an aggregated per-class score before taking the min score over the classes. (4) Finally, we apply the threshold on this minimum.

It is computationally efficient, benefits from stable hyper-parameters, and is well suited to the unsupervised setting.

### 3.4 Comparison to Baseline Methods

Current State-of-the-art methods for OOD detection on textual data have been recently provided in Colombo et al. (2022) (PW). They aggregate the hidden layers using Power means (Hardy et al. 1952; Rücklé et al. 2018) and then apply an OOD score on this aggregated representation. They achieved previous SOTA performance by coupling it with the IRW depth and proposed a comparison with Mahalanobis and Cosine versions. We reproduce these results as it is a natural baseline for aggregation algorithms.

**Last Layer.** Considering that the model’s last layer or logits should output the most abstract representation of an input, it has been the primary focus of attention for OOD detection. It is a natural choice for any architecture or model and therefore removes the hurdle of selecting features for different tasks and architectures. For this heuristic, we obtain OOD scores using the Mahalanobis distance (as in (Lee et al. 2018)), the IRW score (as in (Colombo et al. 2022)), and the cosine similarity (as in (Winkens et al. 2020b)).

**Additional methods.** It is common on OOD detection methods to report the Maximum Softmax Prediction (MSP) (Hendrycks and Gimpel 2016) as well as the Energy Score ( $E$ ) (Liu et al. 2020).

## 4 MILTOOD-C: A more realistic benchmark

In this section, we highlight the limitations of existing benchmarks and introduce our own: MILTOOD-C A **M**ulti **L**ingual **T**ext **O**OD for classification tasks.

### 4.1 Limitation of Existing Benchmarks

**Number of classes.** Text classification benchmarks for OOD detection often consist of sentiment analysis tasks involving a small number of classes (Fang and Zhan 2015; Kharde, Sonawane et al. 2016). Those tasks with a larger number of classes have been mostly ignored in previous OOD detection benchmarks (Colombo et al. 2022; Li et al. 2021; Zhou, Liu, and Chen 2021). However, real-world problems do involve vastly multi-class classification tasks (Casanueva et al. 2020). Previous work in computer vision found that these problems require newer and carefully tuned methods to enable OOD

detection in this more realistic setting (Deng et al. 2009; Le and Yang 2015).

**Monolingual datasets.** Most methods have been tested on architectures tailored for the English language (Colombo et al. 2022; Li et al. 2021; Arora, Huang, and He 2021). With inclusivity and diversity in mind (Ruder 2022; van Esch et al. 2022), it is necessary to assess the performance of old and new OOD detection methods on a variety of languages (Srinivasan et al. 2021; de Vries, van Cranenburgh, and Nissim 2020; Baheti et al. 2021; Zhang et al. 2022).

### 4.2 A more realistic benchmark

We now present MILTOOD-C, which addresses the aforementioned limitations. It consists of more than 25 datasets involving up to 150 classes and 4 languages.

**Dataset selection.** We gathered a large and diverse benchmark encompassing many shift typologies, tasks, and languages. It covers 27 datasets in 4 different languages (*i.e.*, English, German, Spanish, and French) and classifications tasks involving 2 to 150 classes. Following standard protocol (Hendrycks et al. 2020), we train a classifier for each in-distribution dataset (IN-DS) while the OOD dataset (OUT-DS) is coming from a different dataset. We provide a comprehensive list of the 180 pairs we considered in Sec. A.2. It is an order of magnitude larger than recent concurrent work from (Colombo et al. 2022).

**English benchmark.** We relied on the benchmark proposed by Zhou, Liu, and Chen (2021); Hendrycks et al. (2020). It features three types of IN-DS: sentiment analysis (*i.e.*, SST2 (Socher et al. 2013), IMDB (Maas et al. 2011)), topic classification (*i.e.*, 20Newsgroup (Joachims 1996)) and question answering (*i.e.*, TREC-10 and TREC-50 (Li and Roth 2002)). We also included the Massive (FitzGerald et al. 2022) dataset and the Banking (Casanueva et al. 2020) for a larger number of classes and NLI datasets (*i.e.*, RTE (Burger and Ferro 2005; Hickl et al. 2006) and MNLI (Williams, Nangia, and Bowman 2018)) following Colombo et al. (2022). To go one step further in terms of number of classes, we considered HINT3 (Arora et al. 2020) and clink (Larson et al. 2019a). We form IN and OOD pairs between the aforementioned tasks.

**Beyond English-centric tasks.**<sup>5</sup> For language-specific datasets, we added the same tasks as for English when available and

<sup>5</sup>We did not work on language changes because they were easily detected with all the methods considered. Instead, we focus on

extended it with language-specific datasets such as the PAWS-S datasets (Yang et al. 2019), film reviews in French and Spanish (Blard 2019). For French and German, we also added the Swiss judgments datasets (Niklaus, Stürmer, and Chalkidis 2022). Finally, we added different tweet classification tasks for each language (English, German, Spanish and French) (Zotova et al. 2020; Barbieri, Espinosa Anke, and Camacho-Collados 2022).

**Model selection.** To ensure that our results are consistent not only across tasks and shifts, but also across model architectures, we train classifiers based on 6 different Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017) decoders: BERT (Devlin et al. 2018) (base, large and multilingual versions), DISTILBERT (Sanh et al. 2019) and RoBERTa (Liu et al. 2019) (base and large versions) fine-tuned on each task.

**Evaluation metrics.** The OOD detection problem is a binary classification problem where the positive class is OUT. We follow concurrent work (Colombo et al. 2022; Darrin, Piantanida, and Colombo 2022) and evaluate our detector using threshold-free metrics such as AUROC  $\uparrow$ , AUPR-IN/AUPR-OUT and threshold based metrics such as FPR  $\downarrow$  at 95% and ERR. For sake of brevity, we report detailed definitions of the metrics in Sec. A.3.

## 5 Experimental Results

### 5.1 Quantifying Aggregation Gains

**Overall results. Data driven aggregation methods (i.e., with reference) consistently outperform any other baselines or tested methods by a significant margin** (see Table 1 and Table 2) on our extensive MILTOOD-C benchmark. According to our experiments, the best combination of hidden feature-based OOD score and aggregation function is to use the Maximum cosine similarity as the underlying OOD score and to aggregate these scores using the IRW data depth ( $s_{IRW}$ ). A first time to get the abnormality of the representations of the input and a second time to assess the abnormality of the set of layer-wise scores through the model. It reaches an average AUROC  $\uparrow$  of 0.99 and a FPR  $\downarrow$  of 0.02. It is a gain of more than 6% compared to the previous *state-of-the-art* methods in terms of AUROC  $\uparrow$  and more than 90% in FPR  $\downarrow$ .

**Most versatile aggregation method.** While the  $s_C$  and  $s_{IRW}$  used as aggregation methods achieve excellent performance when paired with  $s_C$  as the underlying OOD score, they fail to aggregate as well other underlying scores. Whereas the isolation forest algorithm is a more versatile and consistent data-driven aggregation method: it yields performance gain for every underlying OOD score.

**Performance of common baselines.** We show that, on average, using the last layer or the logits as features to perform OOD detection leads to poorer results than almost every other method. **It is interesting to point out that this is not the case in computer vision (Yang et al. 2021; Raghuram et al. 2021; Picot et al. 2023; Lee et al. 2018). This finding further motivates the development of OOD detection methods tailored for text.**

**Impact of data-driven aggregation.** In almost all scenarios, aggregating the score using a data-driven anomaly detection

intra-language drifts.

	$\mathcal{A}$	AUROC $\uparrow$	FPR $\downarrow$	Err
Agg	$s_M$	0.88 $\pm 0.16$	0.32 $\pm 0.35$	0.16 $\pm 0.19$
	$s_C$	0.91 $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.21</b> $\pm 0.35$	0.13 $\pm 0.21$
	$s_{IRW}$	0.87 $\pm 0.18$	0.30 $\pm 0.39$	0.16 $\pm 0.21$
	IF	<b>0.92</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.21</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.10</b> $\pm 0.15$
	LOF	0.87 $\pm 0.15$	0.37 $\pm 0.36$	0.19 $\pm 0.22$
Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.84 $\pm 0.18$	<u>0.43</u> $\pm 0.40$	<u>0.24</u> $\pm 0.25$
	Med.	0.83 $\pm 0.17$	0.46 $\pm 0.39$	0.25 $\pm 0.25$
	PW	0.82 $\pm 0.17$	0.48 $\pm 0.39$	<u>0.23</u> $\pm 0.23$
Bas.	$E$	0.83 $\pm 0.18$	<u>0.39</u> $\pm 0.30$	<u>0.19</u> $\pm 0.18$
	L. L.	<u>0.84</u> $\pm 0.17$	0.42 $\pm 0.37$	0.20 $\pm 0.22$
	LogS.	0.75 $\pm 0.16$	0.60 $\pm 0.34$	0.30 $\pm 0.25$
	MSP	0.83 $\pm 0.17$	0.39 $\pm 0.28$	0.19 $\pm 0.18$

Table 1: Overall average performance of each aggregation method for all architectures, tasks, and OOD scores. The best method overall is highlighted in bold and the best methods per setting are underlined.

			AUROC $\uparrow$	FPR $\downarrow$	
$E$	Ours	Bas.	<u>0.83</u> $\pm 0.18$	<u>0.39</u> $\pm 0.31$	
		Agg.			
	Agg	$s_M$	$s_M$	0.90 $\pm 0.14$	0.27 $\pm 0.33$
		$s_C$	$s_C$	0.88 $\pm 0.17$	0.32 $\pm 0.40$
		$s_{IRW}$	$s_{IRW}$	0.81 $\pm 0.20$	0.44 $\pm 0.42$
		IF	IF	<u>0.94</u> $\pm 0.10$	<u>0.19</u> $\pm 0.25$
		LOF	LOF	0.87 $\pm 0.15$	0.39 $\pm 0.37$
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	Mean	0.74 $\pm 0.18$	<u>0.59</u> $\pm 0.39$
		Median	Median	0.75 $\pm 0.17$	0.61 $\pm 0.35$
		PW	PW	<u>0.80</u> $\pm 0.17$	0.61 $\pm 0.38$
Bas.	Last layer	Last layer	<u>0.92</u> $\pm 0.11$	<u>0.25</u> $\pm 0.31$	
	Logits	Logits	0.71 $\pm 0.14$	0.65 $\pm 0.27$	
$s_M$	Agg	$s_M$	0.93 $\pm 0.11$	0.20 $\pm 0.27$	
		$s_C$	0.98 $\pm 0.10$	0.04 $\pm 0.19$	
		$s_{IRW}$	<b>0.99</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.02</b> $\pm 0.15$	
	IF	0.94 $\pm 0.14$	0.12 $\pm 0.29$		
	LOF	0.93 $\pm 0.11$	0.20 $\pm 0.26$		
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	Mean	0.93 $\pm 0.12$	0.25 $\pm 0.33$
Median		Median	0.92 $\pm 0.12$	0.27 $\pm 0.34$	
PW		PW	0.93 $\pm 0.11$	<u>0.19</u> $\pm 0.27$	
Bas.	Last layer	Last layer	<u>0.92</u> $\pm 0.11$	<u>0.22</u> $\pm 0.26$	
	Logits	Logits	0.81 $\pm 0.17$	0.52 $\pm 0.42$	
$s_C$	Agg	$s_M$	0.81 $\pm 0.18$	0.50 $\pm 0.38$	
		$s_C$	<u>0.89</u> $\pm 0.17$	<u>0.28</u> $\pm 0.36$	
		$s_{IRW}$	0.82 $\pm 0.19$	0.43 $\pm 0.39$	
	IF	0.89 $\pm 0.15$	0.34 $\pm 0.36$		
	LOF	0.82 $\pm 0.15$	0.54 $\pm 0.35$		
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	Mean	<u>0.84</u> $\pm 0.18$	<u>0.47</u> $\pm 0.40$
Median		Median	0.82 $\pm 0.18$	0.50 $\pm 0.39$	
PW		PW	0.74 $\pm 0.17$	0.64 $\pm 0.34$	
Bas.	Last layer	Last layer	0.66 $\pm 0.14$	0.79 $\pm 0.21$	
	Logits	Logits	0.73 $\pm 0.16$	0.64 $\pm 0.28$	
MSP	Bas.	MSP	<u>0.83</u> $\pm 0.17$	<u>0.39</u> $\pm 0.28$	

Table 2: Average performance of each considered metric over all the OOD pairs and model architectures in terms of AUROC  $\uparrow$ , ERR, and FPR  $\downarrow$ . For each common OOD score, we report the results obtained using every aggregation method or choice of features to consider. The best method overall is highlighted in bold and the best methods per underlying metric and setting are underlined.




Figure 3: Average performance of OOD detectors in terms of AUROC  $\uparrow$  for tasks involving different numbers of classes.

method leads to a significant gain in performance compared to baseline methods. This supports our claim that useful information is scattered across the layers currently ignored by most methods. **We show that this information can be retrieved and effectively leveraged to improve OOD detection.**

## 5.2 Post Aggregation Is More Stable Across Task, Language, Model Architecture

Most OOD scores have been crafted and finetuned for specific settings. In the case of NLP, they have usually been validated only on datasets involving a small number of classes or on English tasks. In this section, we study the stability and consistency of the performance of each score and aggregation method in different settings.

**Stability of performance across tasks.** In Fig. 3, we plot the average AUROC  $\uparrow$  across our models and datasets per number of classes of the IN dataset. It is, therefore, the number of classes output by the model. Our best post-aggregation methods (*i.e.*, Maximum cosine similarity and Integrated Rank-Weighted) produced more consistent results across all settings. It can maintain excellent performance for all types of datasets, whereas the performance of baselines and other aggregation methods tends to fluctuate from one setting to another. *More generally, we observe that data-driven aggregation methods tend to perform consistently on all tasks, whereas previous baselines' performance tends to vary.*

**Features aggregation vs. OOD scores aggregation.** Interestingly, we show that while Power Means pre-aggregation of the features yields better results than single-layer scores, they still follow the same trend, and the gain is more minor and inconsistent.

**Stability of results across languages.** In Fig. 4 we present the deviations in performance of the different OOD detection methods and show that our methods are significantly more robust across languages and tasks than baselines and previous SOTA.

**Comparison with the oracle.** As shown in Fig. 1, there often exists a layer that yields very high OOD detection performance. An oracle that knows which layer to consider would perform better than all of the baselines and SOTA, as they know the best layer. In Fig. 5, we show that our aggregation methods can outperform that oracle (Green bar,  $S_C$  scores aggregated with  $S_{IRW}$ ), whereas SOTA and baselines yield




Figure 4: Stability and robustness comparison of the best-performing aggregation methods and underlying OOD scores with  $S_C$  as underlying OOD score. Common baselines and SOTA display significant deviations in performance with the different languages, whereas score aggregation methods induce more consistent and better performance.




Figure 5: Average performance difference in terms of AUROC between aggregation methods and the oracle (best possible layer).

significantly worse results.

## 6 Conclusions

We proposed aggregating OOD scores across all the layers of the encoder of a text classifier instead of relying on scores computed on a single hand-picked layer (logits) to improve OOD detection. We confirmed that all the layers are not equal regarding OOD detection and, more importantly, that the common choices for OOD detection (logits) are often not the best choice. We validated our methods on an extended text OOD classification benchmark MILTOOD-C we introduced. We showed that our aggregation methods are not only able to outperform previous baselines and recent work, but they were also able to outperform an oracle that would be able to choose the best layer to perform OOD detection for a given task. This leads us to conclude that valuable information for OOD detection is scattered across all the encoder layers. While this tool shows promising results, it should not be trusted blindly. It relies on anomaly detection with respect to the training set and thus can remove otherwise well-handled samples. It is also not infallible and can miss OOD samples, which can cause harm to the model's performance.

## 7 Acknowledgements

We thank our reviewers for their insights and useful advice during the different reviewing processes. This work was performed using HPC resources from GENCI–IDRIS (Grant 2022-AD011013945). This work was supported by HPC resources of CINES and GENCI. The authors would like to thank the staff of CINES for technical support in managing the Adastra GPU cluster, in particular; Jean-Christophe Penalva, Johanne Charpentier, Mathieu Cloirec, Jerome Castaigns, Gérard Vernou, Bertrand Cirou and José Ricardo Kouakou.

## References

- Abdelzad, V.; Czarnecki, K.; Salay, R.; Denoueden, T.; Vernekar, S.; and Phan, B. 2019. Detecting Out-of-Distribution Inputs in Deep Neural Networks Using an Early-Layer Output. *arXiv:1910.10307*.
- Arora, G.; Jain, C.; Chaturvedi, M.; and Modi, K. 2020. HINT3: Raising the bar for Intent Detection in the Wild. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Insights from Negative Results in NLP*, 100–105. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arora, U.; Huang, W.; and He, H. 2021. Types of Out-of-Distribution Texts and How to Detect Them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06827*.
- Artetxe, M.; Ruder, S.; and Yogatama, D. 2019. On the cross-lingual transferability of monolingual representations. *CoRR*, abs/1910.11856.
- Baheti, A.; Sap, M.; Ritter, A.; and Riedl, M. 2021. Just say no: Analyzing the stance of neural dialogue generation in offensive contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.11830*.
- Ballas, A.; and Diou, C. 2022. Multi-layer Representation Learning for Robust OOD Image Classification. In *Proceedings of the 12th Hellenic Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. ACM.
- Barbieri, F.; Espinosa Anke, L.; and Camacho-Collados, J. 2022. XLM-T: Multilingual Language Models in Twitter for Sentiment Analysis and Beyond. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, 258–266. Marseille, France: European Language Resources Association.
- Berend, D.; Xie, X.; Ma, L.; Zhou, L.; Liu, Y.; Xu, C.; and Zhao, J. 2020. Cats are not fish: Deep learning testing calls for out-of-distribution awareness. In *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 1041–1052.
- Blard, T. 2019. French sentiment analysis with BERT. <https://github.com/TheophileBlard/french-sentiment-analysis-with-bert>.
- Breunig, M. M.; Kriegel, H.-P.; Ng, R. T.; and Sander, J. 2000. LOF: identifying density-based local outliers. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, 93–104.
- Bulusu, S.; Kailkhura, B.; Li, B.; Varshney, P. K.; and Song, D. 2020. Anomalous example detection in deep learning: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 8: 132330–132347.
- Burger, J.; and Ferro, L. 2005. Generating an entailment corpus from news headlines. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Empirical Modeling of Semantic Equivalence and Entailment*, 49–54. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Casanueva, I.; Temcinas, T.; Gerz, D.; Henderson, M.; and Vulic, I. 2020. Efficient Intent Detection with Dual Sentence Encoders. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on NLP for ConvAI - ACL 2020*. Data available at <https://github.com/PolyAI-LDN/task-specific-datasets>.
- Colombo, P.; Gomes, E. D. C.; Staerman, G.; Noiry, N.; and Piantanida, P. 2022. Beyond Mahalanobis Distance for Textual OOD Detection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Conneau, A.; Rinott, R.; Lample, G.; Williams, A.; Bowman, S. R.; Schwenk, H.; and Stoyanov, V. 2018. XNLI: Evaluating Cross-lingual Sentence Representations. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dara, S.; and Tumma, P. 2018. Feature Extraction By Using Deep Learning: A Survey. In *2018 Second International Conference on Electronics, Communication and Aerospace Technology (ICECA)*, 1795–1801.
- Darrin, M.; Piantanida, P.; and Colombo, P. 2022. Rain-proof: An Umbrella To Shield Text Generators From Out-Of-Distribution Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09171*.
- de Vries, W.; van Cranenburgh, A.; and Nissim, M. 2020. What’s so special about BERT’s layers? A closer look at the NLP pipeline in monolingual and multilingual models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.06499*.
- Demszky, D.; Movshovitz-Attias, D.; Ko, J.; Cowen, A.; Nemade, G.; and Ravi, S. 2020. GoEmotions: A Dataset of Fine-Grained Emotions. In *58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*.
- Deng, J.; Dong, W.; Socher, R.; Li, L.-J.; Li, K.; and Fei-Fei, L. 2009. ImageNet: A Large-Scale Hierarchical Image Database. In *CVPR09*.
- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.-W.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Esmailpour, S.; Liu, B.; Robertson, E.; and Shu, L. 2022. Zero-Shot Out-of-Distribution Detection Based on the Pre-trained Model CLIP. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*.
- Fang, X.; and Zhan, J. 2015. Sentiment analysis using product review data. *Journal of Big Data*, 2(1): 1–14.
- Fang, Z.; Li, Y.; Lu, J.; Dong, J.; Han, B.; and Liu, F. 2022. Is Out-of-Distribution Detection Learnable? In Oh, A. H.; Agarwal, A.; Belgrave, D.; and Cho, K., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- FitzGerald, J.; Hench, C.; Peris, C.; Mackie, S.; Rottmann, K.; Sanchez, A.; Nash, A.; Urbach, L.; Kakarala, V.; Singh, R.; Ranganath, S.; Crist, L.; Britan, M.; Leeuwis, W.; Tur, G.; and Natarajan, P. 2022. MASSIVE: A 1M-Example Multilingual Natural Language Understanding Dataset with 51 Typologically-Diverse Languages. *arXiv:2204.08582*.

- Gomes, E. D. C.; Alberge, F.; Duhamel, P.; and Piantanida, P. 2022. Igeood: An Information Geometry Approach to Out-of-Distribution Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07798*.
- Hardy, G. H.; Littlewood, J. E.; Pólya, G.; Pólya, G.; et al. 1952. *Inequalities*. Cambridge university press.
- Hendrycks, D.; Basart, S.; Mu, N.; Kadavath, S.; Wang, F.; Dorundo, E.; Desai, R.; Zhu, T.; Parajuli, S.; Guo, M.; et al. 2021. The many faces of robustness: A critical analysis of out-of-distribution generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 8340–8349.
- Hendrycks, D.; and Gimpel, K. 2016. A baseline for detecting misclassified and out-of-distribution examples in neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02136*.
- Hendrycks, D.; Liu, X.; Wallace, E.; Dziedzic, A.; Krishnan, R.; and Song, D. 2020. Pretrained transformers improve out-of-distribution robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.06100*.
- Hickl, A.; Williams, J.; Bensley, J.; Roberts, K.; Rink, B.; and Shi, Y. 2006. Recognizing textual entailment with LCC’s GROUNDHOG system. In *Proceedings of the Second PASCAL Challenges Workshop*.
- Hovy, E.; Gerber, L.; Hermjakob, U.; Lin, C.-Y.; and Ravichandran, D. 2001. Toward Semantics-Based Answer Pinpointing. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Human Language Technology Research*.
- Huang, H.; Li, Z.; Wang, L.; Chen, S.; Dong, B.; and Zhou, X. 2020. Feature space singularity for out-of-distribution detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.14654*.
- Huang, R.; and Li, Y. 2021. Mos: Towards scaling out-of-distribution detection for large semantic space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 8710–8719.
- Huang, W.; Wang, H.; Xia, J.; Wang, C.; and Zhang, J. 2022. Density-driven Regularization for Out-of-distribution Detection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Ilin, R.; Watson, T.; and Kozma, R. 2017. Abstraction hierarchy in deep learning neural networks. In *2017 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 768–774. IEEE.
- Jakubovitz, D.; Giryas, R.; and Rodrigues, M. R. 2019. Generalization error in deep learning. In *Compressed sensing and its applications*, 153–193. Springer.
- Joachims, T. 1996. A Probabilistic Analysis of the Rocchio Algorithm with TFIDF for Text Categorization. Technical report, Carnegie-mellon univ pittsburgh pa dept of computer science.
- Khalid, U.; Esmaeili, A.; Karim, N.; and Rahnavard, N. 2022. Rodd: A self-supervised approach for robust out-of-distribution detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02553*.
- Kharde, V.; Sonawane, P.; et al. 2016. Sentiment analysis of twitter data: a survey of techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.06971*.
- Kozma, R.; Ilin, R.; and Siegelmann, H. T. 2018. Evolution of Abstraction Across Layers in Deep Learning Neural Networks. *Procedia Computer Science*, 144: 203–213.
- Lang, K. 1995. NewsWeeder: Learning to Filter Netnews. In Prieditis, A.; and Russell, S., eds., *Machine Learning Proceedings 1995*, 331–339. San Francisco (CA): Morgan Kaufmann. ISBN 978-1-55860-377-6.
- Larson, S.; Mahendran, A.; Peper, J. J.; Clarke, C.; Lee, A.; Hill, P.; Kummerfeld, J. K.; Leach, K.; Laurenzano, M. A.; Tang, L.; and Mars, J. 2019a. An Evaluation Dataset for Intent Classification and Out-of-Scope Prediction. *CoRR*, abs/1909.02027.
- Larson, S.; Mahendran, A.; Peper, J. J.; Clarke, C.; Lee, A.; Hill, P.; Kummerfeld, J. K.; Leach, K.; Laurenzano, M. A.; Tang, L.; et al. 2019b. An evaluation dataset for intent classification and out-of-scope prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02027*.
- Le, Y.; and Yang, X. 2015. Tiny ImageNet Visual Recognition Challenge.
- Lee, J.; Prabhushankar, M.; and AlRegib, G. 2022. Gradient-Based Adversarial and Out-of-Distribution Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08255*.
- Lee, K.; Lee, K.; Lee, H.; and Shin, J. 2018. A simple unified framework for detecting out-of-distribution samples and adversarial attacks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- Li, X.; Li, J.; Sun, X.; Fan, C.; Zhang, T.; Wu, F.; Meng, Y.; and Zhang, J. 2021.  $k$  Folden:  $k$ -Fold Ensemble for Out-Of-Distribution Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12731*.
- Li, X.; and Roth, D. 2002. Learning Question Classifiers. In *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- Liang, S.; Li, Y.; and Srikant, R. 2018. Enhancing The Reliability of Out-of-distribution Image Detection in Neural Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lin, Z.; Roy, S. D.; and Li, Y. 2021. Mood: Multi-level out-of-distribution detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 15313–15323.
- Liu, F. T.; Ting, K. M.; and Zhou, Z.-H. 2008. Isolation Forest. In *In Proceedings 8th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, 413–422.
- Liu, W.; Wang, X.; Owens, J.; and Li, Y. 2020. Energy-based Out-of-distribution Detection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Liu, Y.; Ott, M.; Goyal, N.; Du, J.; Joshi, M.; Chen, D.; Levy, O.; Lewis, M.; Zettlemoyer, L.; and Stoyanov, V. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Maas, A. L.; Daly, R. E.; Pham, P. T.; Huang, D.; Ng, A. Y.; and Potts, C. 2011. Learning Word Vectors for Sentiment Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 142–150. Portland, Oregon, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- McAllister, R.; Kahn, G.; Clune, J.; and Levine, S. 2019. Robustness to out-of-distribution inputs via task-aware generative uncertainty. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2083–2089. IEEE.

- Niklaus, J.; Stürmer, M.; and Chalkidis, I. 2022. An Empirical Study on Cross-X Transfer for Legal Judgment Prediction. *arXiv:2209.12325*.
- Pearce, T.; Brintrup, A.; and Zhu, J. 2021. Understanding softmax confidence and uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04972*.
- Picot, M.; Noiry, N.; Piantanida, P.; and Colombo, P. 2023. Adversarial Attack Detection Under Realistic Constraints.
- Podolskiy, A.; Lipin, D.; Bout, A.; Artemova, E.; and Piontkovskaya, I. 2021. Revisiting Mahalanobis Distance for Transformer-Based Out-of-Domain Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.03778*.
- Raghuram, J.; Chandrasekaran, V.; Jha, S.; and Banerjee, S. 2021. A general framework for detecting anomalous inputs to dnn classifiers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 8764–8775. PMLR.
- Ramsay, K.; Durocher, S.; and Leblanc, A. 2019. Integrated rank-weighted depth. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 173: 51–69.
- Ren, J.; Liu, P. J.; Fertig, E.; Snoek, J.; Poplin, R.; Depristo, M.; Dillon, J.; and Lakshminarayanan, B. 2019. Likelihood Ratios for Out-of-Distribution Detection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Rücklé, A.; Eger, S.; Peyrard, M.; and Gurevych, I. 2018. Concatenated power mean word embeddings as universal cross-lingual sentence representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01400*.
- Ruder, S. 2022. The State of Multilingual AI. <http://ruder.io/state-of-multilingual-ai/>.
- Sanh, V.; Debut, L.; Chaumond, J.; and Wolf, T. 2019. DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Schwinn, L.; Nguyen, A.; Raab, R.; Bungert, L.; Tenbrinck, D.; Zanca, D.; Burger, M.; and Eskofier, B. 2021. Identifying untrustworthy predictions in neural networks by geometric gradient analysis. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 854–864. PMLR.
- Serrà, J.; Álvarez, D.; Gómez, V.; Slizovskaia, O.; Núñez, J. F.; and Luque, J. 2019. Input complexity and out-of-distribution detection with likelihood-based generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11480*.
- Socher, R.; Perelygin, A.; Wu, J.; Chuang, J.; Manning, C. D.; Ng, A.; and Potts, C. 2013. Recursive Deep Models for Semantic Compositionality Over a Sentiment Treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 1631–1642. Seattle, Washington, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Srinivasan, A.; Sitaram, S.; Ganu, T.; Dandapat, S.; Bali, K.; and Choudhury, M. 2021. Predicting the performance of multilingual nlp models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08875*.
- Staerman, G.; Mozharovskiy, P.; and Cléménçon, S. 2021. Affine-Invariant Integrated Rank-Weighted Depth: Definition, Properties and Finite Sample Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11068*.
- Sun, Y.; Ming, Y.; Zhu, X.; and Li, Y. 2022. Out-of-distribution Detection with Deep Nearest Neighbors. In *ICML*.
- Techapanurak, E.; Sukanuma, M.; and Okatani, T. 2019. Hyperparameter-free out-of-distribution detection using softmax of scaled cosine similarity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10628*.
- Vamvas, J.; and Sennrich, R. 2020. X-stance: A multilingual multi-target dataset for stance detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.08385*.
- van Esch, D.; Lucassen, T.; Ruder, S.; Caswell, I.; and Rivera, C. 2022. Writing system and speaker metadata for 2,800+ language varieties. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, 5035–5046.
- Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Wang, A.; Pruksachatkun, Y.; Nangia, N.; Singh, A.; Michael, J.; Hill, F.; Levy, O.; and Bowman, S. R. 2019. Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.00537*.
- Wang, A.; Singh, A.; Michael, J.; Hill, F.; Levy, O.; and Bowman, S. R. 2018. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461*.
- Wang, H.; Li, Z.; Feng, L.; and Zhang, W. 2022a. ViM: Out-Of-Distribution with Virtual-logit Matching. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 4921–4930.
- Wang, H.; Zhao, C.; Zhao, X.; and Chen, F. 2022b. Layer Adaptive Deep Neural Networks for Out-of-Distribution Detection. In *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining: 26th Pacific-Asia Conference, PAKDD 2022, Chengdu, China, May 16–19, 2022, Proceedings, Part II*, 526–538. Springer.
- Wang, Y.; Zou, J.; Lin, J.; Ling, Q.; Pan, Y.; Yao, T.; and Mei, T. 2022c. Out-of-Distribution Detection via Conditional Kernel Independence Model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Williams, A.; Nangia, N.; and Bowman, S. 2018. A Broad-Coverage Challenge Corpus for Sentence Understanding through Inference. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, 1112–1122. New Orleans, Louisiana: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Winkens, J.; Bunel, R.; Roy, A. G.; Stanforth, R.; Nataraajan, V.; Ledsam, J. R.; MacWilliams, P.; Kohli, P.; Karthikesalingam, A.; Kohl, S.; et al. 2020a. Contrastive training for improved out-of-distribution detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.05566*.
- Winkens, J.; Bunel, R.; Roy, A. G.; Stanforth, R.; Nataraajan, V.; Ledsam, J. R.; MacWilliams, P.; Kohli, P.; Karthikesalingam, A.; Kohl, S. A. A.; taylan. cemgil; Eslami, S.

- M. A.; and Ronneberger, O. 2020b. Contrastive Training for Improved Out-of-Distribution Detection. *ArXiv*, abs/2007.05566.
- Xu, H.; He, K.; Yan, Y.; Liu, S.; Liu, Z.; and Xu, W. 2020. A deep generative distance-based classifier for out-of-domain detection with mahalanobis space. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 1452–1460.
- Yang, J.; Zhou, K.; Li, Y.; and Liu, Z. 2021. Generalized Out-of-Distribution Detection: A Survey.
- Yang, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Tar, C.; and Baldridge, J. 2019. PAWS-X: A Cross-lingual Adversarial Dataset for Paraphrase Identification. In *Proc. of EMNLP*.
- Zhang, Q.; Shen, X.; Chang, E.; Ge, J.; and Chen, P. 2022. MDIA: A Benchmark for Multilingual Dialogue Generation in 46 Languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13078*.
- Zhou, W.; Liu, F.; and Chen, M. 2021. Contrastive Out-of-Distribution Detection for Pretrained Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08812*.
- Zotova, E.; Agerri, R.; Nuñez, M.; and Rigau, G. 2020. Multilingual Stance Detection in Tweets: The Catalonia Independence Corpus. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, 1368–1375. Marseille, France: European Language Resources Association. ISBN 979-10-95546-34-4.

## A Benchmark details

### A.1 Datasets references

Table 3: List of Datasets

Dataset Name	URL
SetFit/emotion	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/SetFit/emotion">https://huggingface.co/datasets/SetFit/emotion</a>
banking77 (Casanueva et al. 2020)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/banking77">https://huggingface.co/datasets/banking77</a>
SetFit/20-newsgroups(Lang 1995)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/SetFit/20_newsgroups">https://huggingface.co/datasets/SetFit/20_newsgroups</a>
imdb (Maas et al. 2011)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/imdb">https://huggingface.co/datasets/imdb</a>
AmazonScience/massive (FitzGerald et al. 2022)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/AmazonScience/massive">https://huggingface.co/datasets/AmazonScience/massive</a>
glue (Wang et al. 2018)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/glue">https://huggingface.co/datasets/glue</a>
super-glue (Wang et al. 2019)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/super_glue">https://huggingface.co/datasets/super_glue</a>
sst2 (Socher et al. 2013)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/sst2">https://huggingface.co/datasets/sst2</a>
trec (Hovy et al. 2001)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/trec">https://huggingface.co/datasets/trec</a>
go-emotions (Demszky et al. 2020)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/go_emotions">https://huggingface.co/datasets/go_emotions</a>
clinc-oos (Larson et al. 2019b)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/clinc_oos">https://huggingface.co/datasets/clinc_oos</a>
HINT3 (Arora et al. 2020)	<a href="https://github.com/hellohaptik/HINT3">https://github.com/hellohaptik/HINT3</a>
xquad (Artetxe, Ruder, and Yogatama 2019)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/xquad">https://huggingface.co/datasets/xquad</a>
catalonia-independence ()	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/catalonia_independence">https://huggingface.co/datasets/catalonia_independence</a>
muchocine ()	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/muchocine">https://huggingface.co/datasets/muchocine</a>
allocine (Blard 2019)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/allocine">https://huggingface.co/datasets/allocine</a>
paws-x (Yang et al. 2019)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/paws-x">https://huggingface.co/datasets/paws-x</a>
swiss-judgment-prediction (Niklaus, Stürmer, and Chalkidis 2022)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/rcds/swiss_judgment_prediction">https://huggingface.co/datasets/rcds/swiss_judgment_prediction</a>
xnli (Conneau et al. 2018)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/xnli/">https://huggingface.co/datasets/xnli/</a>
tweet-sentiment-multilingual (Barbieri, Espinosa Anke, and Camacho-Collados 2022)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/cardiffnlp/tweet_sentiment_multilingual">https://huggingface.co/datasets/cardiffnlp/tweet_sentiment_multilingual</a>
xstance(Vamvas and Sennrich 2020)	<a href="https://huggingface.co/datasets/x_stance">https://huggingface.co/datasets/x_stance</a>

### A.2 OOD pairs

Language	IN-DS	OUT-DS
English	20ng	go-emotions,sst2,imdb,trec,mnli,snli,rte,b77,massive,trec-fine,emotion
	b77	go-emotions,sst2,imdb,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,rte,massive,trec-fine,emotion
	emotion	go-emotions,sst2,imdb,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,rte,b77,massive,trec-fine
	go-emotions	sst2,imdb,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,rte,b77,massive,trec-fine,emotion
	imdb	go-emotions,sst2,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,rte,b77,massive,trec-fine,emotion
	massive	go-emotions,sst2,imdb,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,rte,b77,trec-fine,emotion
	rte	go-emotions,sst2,imdb,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,b77,massive,trec-fine,emotion
	sst2	go-emotions,imdb,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,rte,b77,massive,trec-fine,emotion
	trec	go-emotions,sst2,imdb,20ng,mnli,snli,rte,b77,massive,trec-fine,emotion
French	trec-fine	go-emotions,sst2,imdb,20ng,trec,mnli,snli,rte,b77,massive,emotion
	fr-allocine	fr-clc,fr-xnli,fr-pawsx,fr-xstance,fr-swiss-judgement,fr-tweet-sentiment
	fr-clc	fr-xnli,fr-pawsx,fr-allocine,fr-xstance,fr-swiss-judgement,fr-tweet-sentiment
	fr-pawsx	fr-clc,fr-xnli,fr-allocine,fr-xstance,fr-swiss-judgement,fr-tweet-sentiment
	fr-swiss-judgement	fr-clc,fr-xnli,fr-pawsx,fr-allocine,fr-xstance,fr-tweet-sentiment
	fr-tweet-sentiment	fr-clc,fr-xnli,fr-pawsx,fr-allocine,fr-xstance,fr-swiss-judgement
German	fr-xnli	fr-clc,fr-pawsx,fr-allocine,fr-xstance,fr-swiss-judgement,fr-tweet-sentiment
	fr-xstance	fr-clc,fr-xnli,fr-pawsx,fr-allocine,fr-swiss-judgement,fr-tweet-sentiment
	de-pawsx	de-xstance,de-swiss-judgement,de-tweet-sentiment
	de-swiss-judgement	de-xstance,de-tweet-sentiment,de-pawsx
Spanish	de-tweet-sentiment	de-xstance,de-swiss-judgement,de-pawsx
	de-xstance	de-swiss-judgement,de-tweet-sentiment,de-pawsx
	es-cine	es-tweet-sentiment,es-pawsx,es-tweet-inde
	es-pawsx	es-tweet-sentiment,es-cine,es-tweet-inde
Spanish	es-tweet-inde	es-tweet-sentiment,es-pawsx,es-cine
	es-tweet-sentiment	es-pawsx,es-cine,es-tweet-inde

Table 4: List of OOD pairs considered in our benchmark for each language., the name reported here in this table are the names of the datasets on the Huggingface datasets hub.

		AUROC $\uparrow$	
Ours	Aggregation		
Agg	$s_M$	0.88	$\pm 0.16$
	$s_C$	0.91	$\pm 0.16$
	$s_{IRW}$	0.85	$\pm 0.19$
	IF	0.92	$\pm 0.13$
	LOF	0.87	$\pm 0.15$
Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.84	$\pm 0.18$
	PW	0.82	$\pm 0.17$
Oracle	Oracle	0.94	$\pm 0.12$

Table 6: Average performance of aggregation scores along with the performance of the oracle that is able to select the best layer to perform OOD detection.

Language	Dataset	Number of classes
English	go-emotions	28
	sst2	2
	imdb	2
	20ng	20
	b77	77
	massive	60
	trec-fine	50
	emotion	6
	trec	6
	rte	2
	mnli	3
	snli	3
	cls	2
	xnli	3
French	pawxx	2
	allocine	2
	xstance	2
	swiss-judgement	2
	tweet-sentiment	3
	xstance	2
German	swiss-judgement	2
	tweet-sentiment	3
	pawxx	2
Spanish	tweet-sentiment	3
	pawxx	2
	cine	5
	tweet-inde	3

Table 5: Details of the datasets composing MILTOOD-C.

### A.3 OOD detection performance metrics

For evaluation we follow previous work in anomaly detection and use AUROC  $\uparrow$ , FPR  $\downarrow$ , AUPR-IN/AUPR-OUT and Err.

**Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ).** The Receiver Operating Characteristic curve is curve obtained by plotting the True positive rate against the False positive rate. The area under this curve is the probability that an in-distribution example  $\mathbf{X}_{in}$  has a anomaly score higher than an OOD sample  $\mathbf{x}_{out}$ : AUROC  $\uparrow = \Pr(s(\mathbf{x}_{in}) > s(\mathbf{x}_{out}))$ . It is given by  $\gamma \mapsto (\Pr(s(\mathbf{x}) > \gamma | Z = 0), \Pr(s(\mathbf{x}) > \gamma | Z = 1))$ .

**False Positive Rate at 95% True Positive Rate (FPR  $\downarrow$ ).** We accept to allow only a given false positive rate  $r$  corresponding to a defined level of safety and we want to know what share of positive samples we actually catch under this constraint. It leads to select a threshold  $\gamma_r$  such that the corresponding TPR equals  $r$ . At this threshold, one then computes:  $\Pr(s(\mathbf{x}) > \gamma_r | Z = 0)$  with  $\gamma_r$  s.t.  $\text{TPR}(\gamma_r) = r$ .  $r$  is chosen depending on the difficulty of the task at hand and the required level of safety.

**Area Under the Precision-Recall curve (AUPR-IN/AUPR-OUT).** The Precision-Recall curve plots the recall (true detection rate) against the precision (actual proportion of OOD amongst the predicted OOD). The area under this curve captures the trade-off between precision and recall made by the model. A high value represents a high precision and a high recall *i.e.* the detector captures most of the positive samples while having few false positives.

**Detection error (Err).** It is simply the probability of miss-classification for the best threshold.

## B Layer importance in OOD detection

Our extensive experiments consistently show that there almost always exists a layer that is excellent at separating OOD data.

In Table 7 we present the AUROC  $\uparrow$  performance of all aggregation with all metrics in comparison with the oracle’s performance. We see that there is much room for improvement and that we are able to extract these improvements and even go further.




Figure 6: Importance (in terms of Shap score of each layer in OOD detection for Go-Emotions as IN-DS with BERT for two different OOD datasets. It represents the importance of each feature (Mahalanobis distance computed at a given layer) for the isolation forest anomaly detection algorithms. We can see that the significant layers are different from one OOD dataset to another and that in both presented cases, the last layer (12) nor the logits (13) are not the most useful ones.

Metric	Ours	Aggregation	AUROC $\uparrow$		
$s_M$	Agg	$s_{IRW}$	0.82	$\pm 0.20$	
		LOF	0.87	$\pm 0.15$	
		$s_C$	0.88	$\pm 0.17$	
		$s_M$	0.91	$\pm 0.14$	
		IF	0.94	$\pm 0.10$	
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.74	$\pm 0.18$	
		PW	0.80	$\pm 0.17$	
	Oracle	Oracle	0.95	$\pm 0.09$	
	$s_C$	Agg	$s_M$	0.93	$\pm 0.11$
			LOF	0.93	$\pm 0.11$
IF			0.94	$\pm 0.14$	
$s_C$			0.98	$\pm 0.09$	
$s_{IRW}$			0.99	$\pm 0.07$	
Agg $_{\emptyset}$		PW	0.93	$\pm 0.11$	
		Mean	0.93	$\pm 0.11$	
Oracle		Oracle	0.97	$\pm 0.07$	
$s_{IRW}$		Agg	$s_M$	0.81	$\pm 0.18$
			$s_{IRW}$	0.81	$\pm 0.19$
	LOF		0.82	$\pm 0.15$	
	$s_C$		0.88	$\pm 0.18$	
	IF		0.89	$\pm 0.15$	
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	PW	0.74	$\pm 0.17$	
		Mean	0.84	$\pm 0.18$	
	Oracle	Oracle	0.90	$\pm 0.16$	

Table 7: Performance per metrics and aggregation with the oracle aggregation for comparison

## B.1 Explainability and layer significance

**Best Layer Selection (Oracle).** In Fig 1, we showed that high OOD detection performance could be reached, provided that we know which is the best layer to perform the OOD detection on. We compare our aggregation methods to an oracle method that always uses the best layer. We show in Fig. 5 that our aggregation’s methods outperform baselines and, in some cases, the performance of the oracle. This means that **our aggregation methods reach and even outperform oracle performance.**

**Retro-engineering and explainability.** We propose an explainability analysis of the learned aggregation algorithms to gain more insights into the layer selection retained by our data-driven detectors. We report in Fig. 6 the SHAP scores of one of them to distinguish Go-Emotions samples from RTE samples and 20 news-group samples. It outlines the different importance of the layers for different tasks. Not surprisingly, we found that different layers better separate different classes and tasks. We also confirm that the last layer is not always the best suited for OOD data separation.

## C Additional aggregation algorithms

We proposed in our work a framework that accommodates a wide range of aggregation algorithms. We focused on unsupervised anomaly detection algorithms and common statistics. However, many others options are available in different flavors. For instance, we focused on per-class anomaly detection but we can redo all our work for all classes at once or implement common OOD scores as aggregation mechanisms. In this section, we propose additional aggregation algorithms that are worth exploring. We provide their formalization and results when available and propose direction for future works.

## C.1 Details of anomaly detection algorithms

**Common OOD scores for score aggregation** We propose to first aggregate the OOD scores using common detectors at a meta level. We apply the Mahalanobis distance ( $S_M$ ), the Maximum Cosine Similarity ( $S_C$ ) and the data depth ( $S_{IRW}$ ) to the scores trajectory through the model. We gather the scores at each layer for a reference set and then compute these scores with the trajectory scores as features instead of the internal representation of the model.

*Local Outlier Factor* It measures the density of objects around a sample to decide whether it is an inlier or an outlier. It relies on the  $k$ -distance of a sample, *e.g.* its distance to its  $k$ th closest neighbour and considers  $N_k(\mathbf{x})$  the set of the  $k$  nearest neighbours.

For stability reasons, the usual LOF method uses the reachability distance<sup>6</sup> which is defined as  $Rd(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \max(k - \text{distance}(\mathbf{x}', d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')), d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$ . Intuitively, it is the distance between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}'$  if they are far enough from each other otherwise they are in the same  $k$  nearest neighbors set and in that case the diameter of the set is used as minimal distance. From these definitions, we

can define the local density of a sample  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\text{dens}_k(\mathbf{x}) = \left( \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in N_k(\mathbf{x})} Rd_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{|N_k(\mathbf{x})|} \right)$ . The LOF score compare the density of a sample

to the densities of its neighbor:  $\text{LOF}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in N_k(\mathbf{x})} \text{dens}_k(\mathbf{x}')}{|N_k(\mathbf{x})| \text{dens}_k(\mathbf{x})}$ . If  $\text{LOF}(\mathbf{x}) = 1$  the sample has the same density as his neighbor, if it's lower than 1 it has a higher density than its neighbor and thus is likely to be an inlier whereas if the score is higher than 1 it has a smaller density than its neighbor and should be an outlier.

*Isolation Forest* This popular algorithm is built on the idea that abnormal instances should be easier to distinguish from normal instances. It leads to a score that measures the complexity of separating samples based on the number of necessary decision trees required to isolate a data point. In addition to its computational ease, it benefits from stable hyper-parameters and is well suited to the unsupervised setting. Formally speaking we consider a recursive partitioning problem which is formalized as an isolation tree structure. The number of trees required to isolate a point is the length of a path through the tree from the root to a leaf.

## C.2 Per-class scoring vs. Global aggregation

We reproduced the common strategy of relying on a per-class OOD score and then using the minimum score over the classes as the OOD score. This strategy relies on the intuition that an IN sample, belonging to a given class will at least have a small anomaly score regarding this class whereas an OOD sample would have only high scores.

However, using our aggregation tools we can imagine relying on per-class OOD scores for the underlying scores but including them in the aggregation mechanism. For comprehensiveness' sake, we report here the results under this setting but we found that in most cases per-class scores remain the better solution.

Following our notations and framework, it means formally that the aggregation algorithms are now not indexed by the classes but take as input a vector containing all the scores per layer and per class:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} : (\mathcal{R}^L \times \mathcal{R}^C) \times (\mathcal{R}^L \times \mathcal{R}^C)^N &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \mathbf{s} \times \mathcal{R} &\mapsto \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{s}, \mathcal{R}), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

		AUROC $\uparrow$		FPR $\downarrow$		Err	
Ours	Aggregation						
	$s_C^*$	0.55	$\pm 0.09$	0.92	$\pm 0.14$	0.48	$\pm 0.27$
	$s_M^*$	0.81	$\pm 0.18$	0.45	$\pm 0.40$	<b>0.22</b>	$\pm 0.23$
Agg	$s_{IRW}^*$	0.79	$\pm 0.19$	0.55	$\pm 0.39$	0.29	$\pm 0.26$
	IF*	<b>0.83</b>	$\pm 0.16$	<b>0.36</b>	$\pm 0.32$	0.22	$\pm 0.22$
	LOF*	0.50	$\pm 0.00$	1.00	$\pm 0.02$	0.45	$\pm 0.30$

Table 8: Overall average performance of each aggregation method overall architectures, tasks and underlying OOD scores when aggregating all layers and classes at once.

**Overall aggregation vs per-class aggregation.** Consistently with previous work, our aggregation methods do not perform as well when used to produce directly a single overall score instead of being used class-wise and then taking the minimum score over the classes. In Table 9 we report the OOD detection performance of this setting.

## C.3 Without reference statistical baselines

The simplest way to aggregate OOD scores is to consider statistical aggregation over the layers and the classes. We showed that even basic aggregations such as taking the median score enable significant gains with respect to the last layer baselines.

<sup>6</sup>which is not a proper mathematical distance since it is not symmetric

Metric	Ours	Aggregation	AUROC $\uparrow$		FPR $\downarrow$		Err	
$s_M$	Agg	$s_C^*$	0.57	$\pm 0.12$	0.89	$\pm 0.19$	0.48	$\pm 0.27$
		$s_M^*$	0.75	$\pm 0.16$	0.67	$\pm 0.35$	0.33	$\pm 0.25$
		$s_{IRW}^*$	0.67	$\pm 0.14$	0.77	$\pm 0.27$	0.38	$\pm 0.23$
		IF*	0.75	$\pm 0.15$	0.55	$\pm 0.29$	0.34	$\pm 0.21$
		LOF*	0.50	$\pm 0.01$	0.99	$\pm 0.03$	0.42	$\pm 0.28$
$s_C$	Agg	$s_C^*$	0.51	$\pm 0.01$	0.97	$\pm 0.02$	0.50	$\pm 0.27$
		$s_M^*$	0.75	$\pm 0.16$	0.53	$\pm 0.34$	0.28	$\pm 0.21$
		$s_{IRW}^*$	0.82	$\pm 0.19$	0.47	$\pm 0.38$	0.24	$\pm 0.24$
		IF*	0.84	$\pm 0.15$	0.34	$\pm 0.32$	0.23	$\pm 0.24$
		LOF*	0.50	$\pm 0.00$	1.00	$\pm 0.00$	0.44	$\pm 0.29$
$s_{IRW}$	Agg	$s_C^*$	0.58	$\pm 0.10$	0.91	$\pm 0.14$	0.45	$\pm 0.26$
		$s_M^*$	0.93	$\pm 0.15$	0.16	$\pm 0.31$	0.07	$\pm 0.11$
		$s_{IRW}^*$	0.86	$\pm 0.18$	0.43	$\pm 0.40$	0.26	$\pm 0.29$
		IF*	0.91	$\pm 0.13$	0.19	$\pm 0.25$	0.11	$\pm 0.15$
		LOF*	0.50	$\pm 0.00$	1.00	$\pm 0.00$	0.50	$\pm 0.30$

Table 9: Average performance of the aggregation methods (*i.e.*, for Agg) performed on the whole score matrix at once (per-class and per-layer scores concatenated into a single vector) instead of aggregation each trajectory separately.

## D Computational cost

**Time complexity.** While the addition of an aggregation method induces obvious additional computational costs they are actually quite limited (they do not slow down the process significantly). They require only to compute the usual OOD scores on each layer (which does not change the asymptotic complexity) and then to perform the inference of common anomaly detection algorithms. For example, Isolation forests are known to have a linear complexity in the number of samples and to be able to perform well and fast with numerous and very high dimensional data.

Aggregation Method	Time (s)
$s_C$	$1.40 \times 10^{-4}$ s
IF	$1.14 \times 10^{-3}$ s
$s_{IRW}$	$5.69 \times 10^{-4}$ s
LOF	$4.95 \times 10^{-4}$ s
$s_M$	$5.82 \times 10^{-3}$ s
max	$3.84 \times 10^{-5}$ s
mean	$3.32 \times 10^{-5}$ s
median	$6.01 \times 10^{-5}$ s
min	$3.32 \times 10^{-5}$ s

Table 10: Computational cost overhead induced by the OOD detection methods on top of a classifier for a single sample.

**Memory footprint.** Perhaps most of the overhead is a memory overhead: for underlying OOD scores relying on a reference set we have to store one trained score for each layer. In the case of the Mahalanobis distance, it means storing  $L$  covariance matrices instead of one in addition of the trained aggregation algorithm.

## E Explainability and variability

Isolation forests are constructed by choosing at random separating plans and thus each run might give different importance to features. We benchmarked the methods over 10 seeds to alleviate variability and validate our results. It showed that while some features could be permuted the overall trend were consistent: features that are not relevant for a run do not significantly gain in importance.

In Fig. 8, we show the relation between AUROC  $\uparrow$  and FPR  $\downarrow$  for all our aggregation methods and underlying metrics for each language we studied. In contrast, the performance of most combinations varies with the language. **We especially notice that  $s_C$  scores aggregated using either the Integrated rank-weighted or  $s_C$  consistently achieve excellent performance across all languages.**

## F Experimental results

### F.1 Performance per tasks

**Language specific results** In Tables 11, 12, 14, 13 we present the average performance of each aggregation methods on each language.

In addition to the global performance, we provide the average OOD detection performance per IN-DS in Tables 15 17 21 and 19 and per OUT-DS in Tables 16 18 22 and 20.




Figure 7: Importance (in terms of shap score of each layer in OOD detection for Go-Emotions as IN-DS with a bert architecture for two different OOD datasets. The first row represents the samples from a dataset containing IN and OUT samples. Each line corresponds to a feature and shows how a given feature’s value influences the model to rule the sample as an anomaly (negative) or as a normal (positive) sample. The features are ranked by importance in the decision. The second row represents the importance of each feature (OOD score computed at a given layer) for the isolation forest anomaly detection algorithms. We can see that the significant layers are different from one OOD dataset to another and that in both presented cases, the last layer (Layer 12) is not the most useful one.




Figure 8: Comparison of the best-performing aggregation methods and underlying OOD scores in terms of AUROC  $\uparrow$  and FPR  $\downarrow$ . We can see that most OOD detectors’ performance varies greatly from language to language. The maximum cosine similarity scores aggregated with IRW (green circle) can maintain its performance in all four studied languages and the isolation forests.

Metric	Ours	Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$	FPR $\downarrow$	Err	AUPR-IN	AUPR-OUT	
<i>E</i>	Bas.	<i>E</i>	<b>0.86</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.29$	<b>0.17</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.82</b> $\pm 0.25$	<b>0.81</b> $\pm 0.22$	
	Bas.	Last layer	0.92 $\pm 0.11$	0.24 $\pm 0.30$	0.12 $\pm 0.17$	0.92 $\pm 0.16$	0.86 $\pm 0.20$	
	Bas.	Logits	0.72 $\pm 0.14$	0.61 $\pm 0.26$	0.30 $\pm 0.22$	0.66 $\pm 0.29$	0.67 $\pm 0.27$	
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	FW	0.82 $\pm 0.19$	0.57 $\pm 0.40$	0.26 $\pm 0.24$	0.84 $\pm 0.22$	0.67 $\pm 0.30$	
		Mean	0.77 $\pm 0.18$	0.54 $\pm 0.40$	0.30 $\pm 0.27$	0.68 $\pm 0.30$	0.76 $\pm 0.28$	
		Median	0.76 $\pm 0.17$	0.60 $\pm 0.37$	0.31 $\pm 0.25$	0.70 $\pm 0.29$	0.70 $\pm 0.29$	
		Max	0.75 $\pm 0.19$	0.55 $\pm 0.40$	0.31 $\pm 0.27$	0.67 $\pm 0.30$	0.75 $\pm 0.29$	
	<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	Bas.	Logits	0.50 $\pm 0.01$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.41 $\pm 0.29$	0.80 $\pm 0.15$	0.70 $\pm 0.15$
		Agg	IF	<b>0.95</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.16</b> $\pm 0.23$	<b>0.09</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.16$
			<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	0.93 $\pm 0.11$	0.20 $\pm 0.29$	0.12 $\pm 0.17$	0.91 $\pm 0.19$	0.90 $\pm 0.17$
<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>			0.91 $\pm 0.16$	0.24 $\pm 0.36$	0.15 $\pm 0.23$	0.89 $\pm 0.20$	0.93 $\pm 0.15$	
LOF			0.90 $\pm 0.14$	0.32 $\pm 0.36$	0.17 $\pm 0.23$	0.88 $\pm 0.20$	0.85 $\pm 0.21$	
Agg		<i>s<sub>M</sub>*</i>	0.78 $\pm 0.15$	0.63 $\pm 0.37$	0.30 $\pm 0.25$	0.75 $\pm 0.27$	0.68 $\pm 0.31$	
		IF*	0.78 $\pm 0.14$	0.49 $\pm 0.27$	0.31 $\pm 0.20$	0.55 $\pm 0.28$	0.84 $\pm 0.22$	
		<i>s<sub>C</sub>*</i>	0.56 $\pm 0.12$	0.89 $\pm 0.19$	0.49 $\pm 0.28$	0.51 $\pm 0.31$	0.59 $\pm 0.29$	
		LoF*	0.50 $\pm 0.01$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.43 $\pm 0.30$	0.71 $\pm 0.23$	0.69 $\pm 0.19$	
		Bas.	Last layer	0.92 $\pm 0.11$	0.22 $\pm 0.26$	0.11 $\pm 0.13$	0.90 $\pm 0.18$	0.88 $\pm 0.18$
	Logits	0.85 $\pm 0.16$	0.44 $\pm 0.41$	0.24 $\pm 0.28$	0.83 $\pm 0.24$	0.81 $\pm 0.23$		
<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>	Bas.	Mean	0.94 $\pm 0.11$	0.22 $\pm 0.31$	0.15 $\pm 0.20$	0.91 $\pm 0.17$	0.93 $\pm 0.16$	
	FW	0.94 $\pm 0.11$	0.17 $\pm 0.26$	0.09 $\pm 0.13$	0.92 $\pm 0.16$	0.91 $\pm 0.17$		
	Min	0.93 $\pm 0.11$	0.24 $\pm 0.31$	0.15 $\pm 0.18$	0.90 $\pm 0.17$	0.91 $\pm 0.18$		
	Median	0.93 $\pm 0.12$	0.26 $\pm 0.34$	0.17 $\pm 0.23$	0.88 $\pm 0.19$	0.92 $\pm 0.16$		
	Max	0.57 $\pm 0.15$	0.90 $\pm 0.29$	0.35 $\pm 0.29$	0.82 $\pm 0.18$	0.71 $\pm 0.18$		
	Agg	<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>	<b>0.98</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.04</b> $\pm 0.20$	<b>0.03</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.98</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.98</b> $\pm 0.12$	
		IF	0.94 $\pm 0.14$	0.11 $\pm 0.29$	0.03 $\pm 0.11$	0.95 $\pm 0.16$	0.85 $\pm 0.23$	
		LOF	0.94 $\pm 0.10$	0.17 $\pm 0.25$	0.09 $\pm 0.12$	0.92 $\pm 0.16$	0.91 $\pm 0.17$	
		<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	0.94 $\pm 0.10$	0.18 $\pm 0.25$	0.10 $\pm 0.13$	0.92 $\pm 0.16$	0.90 $\pm 0.17$	
		IF*	<b>0.88</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.25</b> $\pm 0.26$	<b>0.18</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.67</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.11$	
<i>s<sub>M</sub>*</i>		0.78 $\pm 0.16$	0.47 $\pm 0.33$	0.25 $\pm 0.20$	0.64 $\pm 0.28$	0.78 $\pm 0.27$		
<i>s<sub>sw</sub></i>	Bas.	Logits	0.50 $\pm 0.01$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.41 $\pm 0.29$	0.80 $\pm 0.15$	0.70 $\pm 0.15$	
	Agg	Logits	0.73 $\pm 0.17$	0.65 $\pm 0.30$	0.28 $\pm 0.21$	0.75 $\pm 0.23$	0.68 $\pm 0.26$	
		Last layer	0.66 $\pm 0.13$	0.79 $\pm 0.21$	0.38 $\pm 0.24$	0.65 $\pm 0.29$	0.64 $\pm 0.26$	
		Max	0.84 $\pm 0.18$	0.45 $\pm 0.40$	0.22 $\pm 0.22$	0.85 $\pm 0.19$	0.83 $\pm 0.22$	
		Mean	0.84 $\pm 0.18$	0.45 $\pm 0.41$	0.22 $\pm 0.23$	0.85 $\pm 0.20$	0.83 $\pm 0.21$	
	Agg	Median	0.82 $\pm 0.18$	0.49 $\pm 0.39$	0.25 $\pm 0.24$	0.82 $\pm 0.22$	0.82 $\pm 0.21$	
		FW	0.75 $\pm 0.17$	0.61 $\pm 0.35$	0.29 $\pm 0.23$	0.75 $\pm 0.26$	0.73 $\pm 0.25$	
		Min	0.50 $\pm 0.01$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.41 $\pm 0.29$	0.80 $\pm 0.15$	0.70 $\pm 0.15$	
		<i>s<sub>M</sub>*</i>	<b>0.99</b> $\pm 0.02$	<b>0.03</b> $\pm 0.05$	<b>0.03</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.99</b> $\pm 0.04$	
		IF*	0.96 $\pm 0.04$	0.10 $\pm 0.10$	0.06 $\pm 0.05$	0.89 $\pm 0.16$	0.96 $\pm 0.07$	
IF		0.89 $\pm 0.14$	0.32 $\pm 0.36$	0.15 $\pm 0.18$	0.89 $\pm 0.18$	0.80 $\pm 0.25$		
<i>MSP</i>	Bas.	<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>	<b>0.88</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.29</b> $\pm 0.38$	<b>0.18</b> $\pm 0.22$	<b>0.88</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.11$	
	LOF	0.84 $\pm 0.15$	0.51 $\pm 0.35$	0.24 $\pm 0.23$	0.84 $\pm 0.23$	0.71 $\pm 0.27$		
	<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	0.81 $\pm 0.18$	0.48 $\pm 0.39$	0.19 $\pm 0.19$	0.84 $\pm 0.21$	0.75 $\pm 0.24$		
	<i>s<sub>C</sub>*</i>	0.60 $\pm 0.10$	0.90 $\pm 0.15$	0.43 $\pm 0.26$	0.60 $\pm 0.29$	0.53 $\pm 0.31$		
	LoF*	0.50 $\pm 0.00$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.51 $\pm 0.31$	0.75 $\pm 0.16$	0.62 $\pm 0.28$		
	Bas.	MSP	<b>0.86</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.26$	<b>0.17</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.81</b> $\pm 0.24$	<b>0.81</b> $\pm 0.20$	

Table 11: Average performance on the english benchamrk.

Metric	Ours	Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$	FPR $\downarrow$	Err	AUPR-IN	AUPR-OUT	
<i>E</i>	Bas.	<i>E</i>	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.62</b> $\pm 0.25$	<b>0.31</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.62</b> $\pm 0.26$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.27$	
	Bas.	Logits	0.61 $\pm 0.08$	0.91 $\pm 0.07$	0.52 $\pm 0.24$	0.55 $\pm 0.26$	0.61 $\pm 0.26$	
	Bas.	Median	0.72 $\pm 0.15$	0.69 $\pm 0.25$	0.41 $\pm 0.21$	0.61 $\pm 0.24$	0.73 $\pm 0.26$	
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	FW	0.69 $\pm 0.12$	0.83 $\pm 0.18$	0.43 $\pm 0.24$	0.70 $\pm 0.24$	0.61 $\pm 0.29$	
		Mean	0.62 $\pm 0.10$	0.80 $\pm 0.16$	0.43 $\pm 0.23$	0.55 $\pm 0.28$	0.63 $\pm 0.26$	
		Max	0.60 $\pm 0.08$	0.84 $\pm 0.15$	0.45 $\pm 0.25$	0.56 $\pm 0.29$	0.60 $\pm 0.26$	
		Min	0.50 $\pm 0.00$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.50 $\pm 0.28$	0.75 $\pm 0.14$	0.75 $\pm 0.14$	
	<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	Bas.	Logits	0.50 $\pm 0.01$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.41 $\pm 0.29$	0.80 $\pm 0.15$	0.70 $\pm 0.15$
		Agg	IF	<b>0.88</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.18</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.85</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.24$
			<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	0.78 $\pm 0.16$	0.59 $\pm 0.34$	0.31 $\pm 0.23$	0.75 $\pm 0.24$	0.73 $\pm 0.29$
<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>			0.74 $\pm 0.19$	0.64 $\pm 0.41$	0.33 $\pm 0.20$	0.79 $\pm 0.15$	0.79 $\pm 0.15$	
LOF			0.73 $\pm 0.14$	0.74 $\pm 0.23$	0.39 $\pm 0.24$	0.67 $\pm 0.29$	0.66 $\pm 0.27$	
Agg		<i>s<sub>C</sub>*</i>	0.59 $\pm 0.12$	0.89 $\pm 0.15$	0.45 $\pm 0.27$	0.59 $\pm 0.31$	0.59 $\pm 0.24$	
		<i>s<sub>M</sub>*</i>	0.57 $\pm 0.05$	0.89 $\pm 0.06$	0.37 $\pm 0.22$	0.66 $\pm 0.25$	0.44 $\pm 0.25$	
		IF*	0.56 $\pm 0.05$	0.89 $\pm 0.05$	0.47 $\pm 0.23$	0.52 $\pm 0.28$	0.56 $\pm 0.28$	
		LoF*	0.50 $\pm 0.01$	1.00 $\pm 0.01$	0.41 $\pm 0.27$	0.70 $\pm 0.20$	0.61 $\pm 0.21$	
		Bas.	Logits	0.64 $\pm 0.12$	0.96 $\pm 0.10$	0.50 $\pm 0.26$	0.62 $\pm 0.26$	0.61 $\pm 0.24$
	Median	0.92 $\pm 0.13$	0.26 $\pm 0.32$	0.17 $\pm 0.23$	0.90 $\pm 0.21$	0.91 $\pm 0.16$		
<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>	Bas.	FW	0.89 $\pm 0.14$	0.29 $\pm 0.30$	0.17 $\pm 0.20$	0.85 $\pm 0.20$	0.88 $\pm 0.20$	
	Mean	0.89 $\pm 0.15$	0.36 $\pm 0.35$	0.21 $\pm 0.23$	0.89 $\pm 0.20$	0.85 $\pm 0.21$		
	Min	0.84 $\pm 0.15$	0.56 $\pm 0.33$	0.29 $\pm 0.24$	0.85 $\pm 0.19$	0.76 $\pm 0.24$		
	Max	0.61 $\pm 0.16$	0.92 $\pm 0.23$	0.48 $\pm 0.29$	0.70 $\pm 0.26$	0.74 $\pm 0.19$		
	Agg	<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.02</b> $\pm 0.01$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	
		IF	0.92 $\pm 0.13$	0.13 $\pm 0.22$	0.07 $\pm 0.14$	0.86 $\pm 0.25$	0.85 $\pm 0.19$	
		LOF	0.87 $\pm 0.14$	0.33 $\pm 0.30$	0.19 $\pm 0.20$	0.82 $\pm 0.21$	0.87 $\pm 0.21$	
		<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	0.87 $\pm 0.15$	0.33 $\pm 0.31$	0.20 $\pm 0.22$	0.81 $\pm 0.23$	0.87 $\pm 0.20$	
		IF*	0.61 $\pm 0.06$	0.81 $\pm 0.11$	0.47 $\pm 0.21$	0.49 $\pm 0.27$	0.65 $\pm 0.25$	
		<i>s<sub>M</sub>*</i>	0.59 $\pm 0.08$	0.86 $\pm 0.12$	0.45 $\pm 0.23$	0.54 $\pm 0.28$	0.57 $\pm 0.29$	
<i>s<sub>sw</sub></i>	Bas.	Logits	0.50 $\pm 0.01$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.41 $\pm 0.29$	0.80 $\pm 0.15$	0.70 $\pm 0.15$	
	Agg	<i>s<sub>C</sub>*</i>	0.51 $\pm 0.01$	0.99 $\pm 0.00$	0.59 $\pm 0.26$	0.42 $\pm 0.27$	0.60 $\pm 0.26$	
		LoF*	0.50 $\pm 0.00$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.50 $\pm 0.28$	0.75 $\pm 0.14$	0.75 $\pm 0.14$	
		Bas.	Logits	0.74 $\pm 0.10$	0.59 $\pm 0.21$	0.31 $\pm 0.19$	0.64 $\pm 0.25$	0.74 $\pm 0.21$
		Median	0.83 $\pm 0.14$	0.59 $\pm 0.35$	0.34 $\pm 0.26$	0.80 $\pm 0.24$	0.77 $\pm 0.24$	
	Agg	Mean	0.82 $\pm 0.15$	0.60 $\pm 0.35$	0.37 $\pm 0.28$	0.76 $\pm 0.27$	0.79 $\pm 0.22$	
		Max	0.80 $\pm 0.15$	0.63 $\pm 0.30$	0.38 $\pm 0.25$	0.73 $\pm 0.27$	0.77 $\pm 0.22$	
		FW	0.66 $\pm 0.09$	0.82 $\pm 0.18$	0.42 $\pm 0.24$	0.64 $\pm 0.28$	0.60 $\pm 0.24$	
		Min	0.50 $\pm 0.00$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.50 $\pm 0.28$	0.75 $\pm 0.14$	0.75 $\pm 0.14$	
		Bas.	<i>s<sub>C</sub></i>	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.27</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.16</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.89</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.12$
IF		0.85 $\pm 0.15$	0.44 $\pm 0.36$	0.22 $\pm 0.21$	0.83 $\pm 0.24$	0.79 $\pm 0.27$		
Agg	<i>s<sub>M</sub></i>	0.77 $\pm 0.17$	0.60 $\pm 0.34$	0.28 $\pm 0.23$	0.78 $\pm 0.25$	0.69 $\pm 0.30$		
	LOF	0.73 $\pm 0.14$	0.76 $\pm 0.27$	0.40 $\pm 0.25$	0.70 $\pm 0.26$	0.66 $\pm 0.29$		
	IF*	0.65 $\pm 0.08$	0.69 $\pm 0.16$	0.38 $\pm 0.20$	0.54 $\pm 0.28$	0.69 $\pm 0.22$		
	<i>s<sub>M</sub>*</i>	0.60 $\pm 0.07$	0.85 $\pm 0.12$	0.28 $\pm 0.15$	0.74 $\pm 0.19$	0.40 $\pm 0.21$		
	<i>s<sub>C</sub>*</i>	0.52 $\pm 0.01$	0.96 $\pm 0.01$	0.55 $\pm 0.26$	0.46 $\pm 0.28$	0.57 $\pm 0.28$		
	LoF*	0.50 $\pm 0.00$	1.00 $\pm 0.00$	0.53 $\pm 0.28$	0.73 $\pm 0.14$	0.64 $\pm 0.26$		
MSP	Bas.	MSP	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.62</b> $\pm 0.25$	<b>0.31</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.25$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.27$	

Table 12: Average performance on the french benchamrk.

## F.2 Performance on datasets with a very large number of classes.

## G Negative results




Figure 9: Performance in OOD detection for the different layers of the ViT models. We can observe that the last layer always yield very good OOD detection performance making aggregation methods (other than just selecting the last layer) somewhat irrelevant or at least not better than the usual heuristic.

Metric	Ours	Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$	FPR $\downarrow$	Err	AUPR-IN	AUPR-OUT
$E$	Bas.	$E$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.67</b> $\pm 0.29$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.67</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.70</b> $\pm 0.17$
	Bas.	Logits	<b>0.62</b> $\pm 0.08$	<b>0.85</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.48</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.55</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.12$
$s_M$	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Median	<b>0.71</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.78</b> $\pm 0.22$	<b>0.43</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.20$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.20$
		FW	<b>0.70</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.46</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.13$
		Mean	<b>0.58</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.47</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.56</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.57</b> $\pm 0.15$
	Agg	Max	<b>0.57</b> $\pm 0.06$	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.48</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.55</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.56</b> $\pm 0.14$
		Min	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.07$
		IF	<b>0.85</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.45</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.18$
		LOF	<b>0.74</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.80</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.42</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.72</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.70</b> $\pm 0.13$
		$s_M$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.45</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.62</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.09$
		$s_C$	<b>0.61</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.46</b> $\pm 0.05$	<b>0.64</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.10$
		IF*	<b>0.56</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.89</b> $\pm 0.05$	<b>0.42</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.60</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.51</b> $\pm 0.11$
		$s_C^*$	<b>0.56</b> $\pm 0.08$	<b>0.94</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.45</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.54</b> $\pm 0.17$
		$s_M^*$	<b>0.53</b> $\pm 0.02$	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.02$	<b>0.49</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.52</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.53</b> $\pm 0.14$
LoF*	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.47</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.68</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.14$		
Bas.	Logits	<b>0.66</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.87</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.46</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.64</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.64</b> $\pm 0.11$	
$s_C$	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	FW	<b>0.85</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.43</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.23</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.17$
		Median	<b>0.85</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.48</b> $\pm 0.37$	<b>0.28</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.16$
		Mean	<b>0.85</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.49</b> $\pm 0.36$	<b>0.28</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.18$
	Agg	Max	<b>0.82</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.58</b> $\pm 0.30$	<b>0.33</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.82</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.80</b> $\pm 0.18$
		Min	<b>0.52</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.49</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.68</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.74</b> $\pm 0.07$
		$s_C$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.01</b> $\pm 0.01$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$
		IF	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.16</b> $\pm 0.38$	<b>0.09</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.95</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.92</b> $\pm 0.16$
		$s_M$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.45</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.82</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.16$
		LOF	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.45</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.81</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.16$
		IF*	<b>0.58</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.44</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.55</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.59</b> $\pm 0.15$
		$s_M^*$	<b>0.55</b> $\pm 0.02$	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.48</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.52</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.56</b> $\pm 0.14$
		$s_C^*$	<b>0.51</b> $\pm 0.01$	<b>0.99</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.47</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.54</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.47</b> $\pm 0.14$
LoF*	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.07$		
Bas.	Logits	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.08$	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.59</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.14$	
$s_{RW}$	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	FW	<b>0.79</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.67</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.37</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.80</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.17$
		Median	<b>0.78</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.64</b> $\pm 0.41$	<b>0.37</b> $\pm 0.26$	<b>0.77</b> $\pm 0.22$	<b>0.77</b> $\pm 0.16$
		Mean	<b>0.76</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.74</b> $\pm 0.25$	<b>0.41</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.77</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.74</b> $\pm 0.16$
	Agg	Max	<b>0.68</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.87</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.45</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.68</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.13$
		Min	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.07$
		$s_C$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.33$	<b>0.28</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.80</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.14$
		IF	<b>0.80</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.53</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.29</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.77</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.79</b> $\pm 0.19$
		$s_M$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.73</b> $\pm 0.28$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.24$
		IF*	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.08$	<b>0.74</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.41</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.55</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.14$
		LOF	<b>0.61</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.47</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.57</b> $\pm 0.15$
		$s_M^*$	<b>0.57</b> $\pm 0.05$	<b>0.89</b> $\pm 0.08$	<b>0.37</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.66</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.46</b> $\pm 0.10$
		$s_C^*$	<b>0.51</b> $\pm 0.01$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.02$	<b>0.53</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.48</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.55</b> $\pm 0.14$
LoF*	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.99</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.46</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.77</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.62</b> $\pm 0.18$		
MSP	Bas.	MSP	<b>0.68</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.23$	<b>0.36</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.11$

Table 13: Average performance on the spanish benchamrk.

Metric	Ours	Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$	FPR $\downarrow$	Err	AUPR-IN	AUPR-OUT
$E$	Bas.	$E$	<b>0.55</b> $\pm 0.29$	<b>0.67</b> $\pm 0.28$	<b>0.36</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.54</b> $\pm 0.34$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.33$
	Bas.	Logits	<b>0.66</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.82</b> $\pm 0.20$	<b>0.54</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.51</b> $\pm 0.35$	<b>0.71</b> $\pm 0.29$
$s_M$	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Median	<b>0.78</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.58</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.38</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.64</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.82</b> $\pm 0.27$
		FW	<b>0.76</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.72</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.43</b> $\pm 0.26$	<b>0.72</b> $\pm 0.24$	<b>0.73</b> $\pm 0.28$
		Mean	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.82</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.16$	<b>0.39</b> $\pm 0.26$
	Agg	Max	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.38</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.66</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.53</b> $\pm 0.30$
		Min	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.34$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.17$
		IF	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.33$	<b>0.07</b> $\pm 0.06$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.81</b> $\pm 0.32$
		$s_M$	<b>0.74</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.62</b> $\pm 0.30$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.28$	<b>0.71</b> $\pm 0.29$	<b>0.73</b> $\pm 0.30$
		LOF	<b>0.74</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.70</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.41</b> $\pm 0.28$	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.34$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.28$
		$s_C$	<b>0.70</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.39</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.73</b> $\pm 0.22$	<b>0.73</b> $\pm 0.15$
		$s_C^*$	<b>0.63</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.25</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.15$	<b>0.40</b> $\pm 0.19$
		IF*	<b>0.57</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.87</b> $\pm 0.05$	<b>0.53</b> $\pm 0.28$	<b>0.44</b> $\pm 0.33$	<b>0.64</b> $\pm 0.30$
		$s_M^*$	<b>0.57</b> $\pm 0.06$	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.06$	<b>0.26</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.78</b> $\pm 0.20$	<b>0.30</b> $\pm 0.22$
LoF*	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.01$	<b>0.31</b> $\pm 0.27$	<b>0.76</b> $\pm 0.20$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.26$		
Bas.	Logits	<b>0.61</b> $\pm 0.08$	<b>0.99</b> $\pm 0.02$	<b>0.58</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.51</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.31$	
$s_C$	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Median	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.23</b> $\pm 0.35$	<b>0.22</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.89</b> $\pm 0.22$	<b>0.97</b> $\pm 0.02$
		Mean	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.11$	<b>0.28</b> $\pm 0.40$	<b>0.26</b> $\pm 0.35$	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.97</b> $\pm 0.03$
		FW	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.18</b> $\pm 0.24$	<b>0.06</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.86</b> $\pm 0.23$
	Agg	Min	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.39</b> $\pm 0.37$	<b>0.32</b> $\pm 0.34$	<b>0.86</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.06$
		Max	<b>0.56</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.98</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.38</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.60</b> $\pm 0.25$
		$s_C$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.02</b> $\pm 0.01$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$
		IF	<b>0.93</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.11</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.02</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.95</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.16$
		$s_M$	<b>0.92</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.17</b> $\pm 0.20$	<b>0.06</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.88</b> $\pm 0.19$
		LOF	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.12$	<b>0.19</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.06</b> $\pm 0.04$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.87</b> $\pm 0.19$
		IF*	<b>0.61</b> $\pm 0.06$	<b>0.78</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.51</b> $\pm 0.23$	<b>0.40</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.73</b> $\pm 0.27$
		$s_M^*$	<b>0.56</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.03$	<b>0.43</b> $\pm 0.29$	<b>0.58</b> $\pm 0.34$	<b>0.49</b> $\pm 0.33$
		$s_C^*$	<b>0.51</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.99</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.76</b> $\pm 0.20$
LoF*	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.34$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.17$		
Bas.	Logits	<b>0.69</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.21$	<b>0.48</b> $\pm 0.29$	<b>0.54</b> $\pm 0.30$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.25$	
$s_{RW}$	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	<b>0.92</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.35</b> $\pm 0.39$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.32$	<b>0.89</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.87</b> $\pm 0.15$
		Median	<b>0.91</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.40</b> $\pm 0.43$	<b>0.24</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.88</b> $\pm 0.23$	<b>0.83</b> $\pm 0.21$
		Max	<b>0.88</b> $\pm 0.13$	<b>0.40</b> $\pm 0.33$	<b>0.28</b> $\pm 0.31$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.24$	<b>0.84</b> $\pm 0.19$
	Agg	FW	<b>0.79</b> $\pm 0.14$	<b>0.86</b> $\pm 0.25$	<b>0.47</b> $\pm 0.35$	<b>0.77</b> $\pm 0.25$	<b>0.65</b> $\pm 0.26$
		Min	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>1.00</b> $\pm 0.00$	<b>0.50</b> $\pm 0.34$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.17$	<b>0.75</b> $\pm 0.17$
		$s_C$	<b>0.96</b> $\pm 0.07$	<b>0.13</b> $\pm 0.19$	<b>0.09</b> $\pm 0.09$	<b>0.94</b> $\pm 0.10$	<b>0.97</b> $\pm 0.06$
		IF	<b>0.90</b> $\pm 0.18$	<b>0.23</b> $\pm 0.$			

Metric	Ours	in Agg.	20ng	emotion	go-emotions	imdb	massive	rte	sst2	trec	trec-fine
$s_C$	Agg	IF	0.95	0.95	<b>0.95</b>	0.91	<b>0.95</b>	0.82	0.91	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>
		LOF	0.99	0.99	0.81	0.97	0.92	0.81	0.94	0.93	0.90
		Mean	0.99	<b>0.99</b>	0.82	0.92	0.92	0.84	0.96	0.93	0.90
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.89	0.98	0.81	0.96	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.88
		PW	0.98	0.99	0.79	0.96	0.92	0.84	<b>0.96</b>	0.93	0.90
		Bas. Last layer	0.96	0.96	0.83	0.95	0.89	0.83	0.87	0.93	0.88
$s_{RW}$	Agg	IF	0.99	0.95	0.81	0.98	0.85	0.91	0.77	0.90	0.88
		LOF	0.92	0.90	0.66	0.78	0.75	<b>0.84</b>	0.78	0.89	0.85
		Mean	0.98	0.91	0.84	0.99	0.80	<b>0.95</b>	0.82	0.90	0.50
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.95	0.89	0.82	0.99	0.78	0.91	0.85	0.86	0.50
		PW	0.87	0.84	0.73	0.91	0.67	0.79	0.77	0.72	0.50
		Bas. Last layer	0.85	0.79	0.72	0.87	0.71	0.80	0.81	0.77	0.50
$s_M$	Agg	IF	<b>1.00</b>	0.98	0.80	<b>1.00</b>	0.92	0.91	0.94	0.90	0.89
		LOF	0.94	0.92	0.73	0.85	0.87	0.85	0.84	0.86	0.92
		Mean	0.91	0.83	0.65	0.72	0.72	0.68	0.72	0.74	0.84
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.79	0.73	0.66	0.71	0.71	0.76	0.68	0.72	0.86
		PW	0.85	0.85	0.65	0.87	0.77	0.76	0.72	0.83	0.90
		Bas. Last layer	0.93	0.85	0.64	0.77	0.79	0.75	0.72	0.83	0.88
Bas. Logits	0.85	0.71	0.65	0.73	0.62	0.61	0.66	0.65	0.76		

Table 15: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation per english IN-DS .

Metric	Ours	out Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$											
			20ng	amazon-reviews-multi	b77	emotion	go-emotions	imdb	massive	rte	snli	sst2	trec	trec-fine
$s_C$	Agg	IF	0.54	0.41	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.53</b>	0.53	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.54</b>	0.52	<b>0.54</b>
		LOF	0.52	0.52	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.52
		Mean	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.50	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.52
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.51	0.53	0.50	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52
		PW	0.52	<b>0.53</b>	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.53	0.52	0.52	0.52
		Bas. Last layer	0.53	0.52	0.49	0.51	0.51	0.53	0.52	0.50	0.53	0.51	0.51	0.52
Bas. Logits	0.50	0.51	0.48	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.52	0.51	0.49	0.50		
$s_{RW}$	Agg	IF	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.52	0.49	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.49	0.50	0.51
		LOF	0.52	0.49	0.47	0.48	0.45	0.52	0.50	0.48	0.46	0.48	0.49	0.49
		Mean	<b>0.54</b>	0.52	0.49	0.50	0.49	0.54	0.50	<b>0.53</b>	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.50
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.53	0.51	0.48	0.49	0.48	0.52	0.50	0.52	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.50
		PW	0.48	0.44	0.45	0.46	0.43	0.47	0.46	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.47	0.48
		Bas. Last layer	0.49	0.47	0.44	0.45	0.44	0.48	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.45	0.46	0.45
Bas. Logits	0.44	0.47	0.45	0.42	0.44	0.44	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.44	0.46	0.47		
$s_M$	Agg	IF	0.51	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.53	0.51	<b>0.53</b>	0.52
		LOF	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.52	0.51	0.53	0.52	0.50	0.51	0.51
		Mean	0.52	0.45	0.46	0.47	0.41	0.52	0.45	0.47	0.50	0.42	0.46	0.42
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.52	0.47	0.42	0.45	0.41	0.51	0.47	0.44	0.49	0.42	0.47	0.43
		PW	0.51	0.49	0.47	0.48	0.47	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.52	0.46	0.49	0.47
		Bas. Last layer	0.52	0.50	0.48	0.49	0.48	0.52	0.49	0.51	0.51	0.48	0.48	0.47
Bas. Logits	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.44		

Table 16: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation methods per english OUT-DS .

Metric	Ours	in Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$							
			fr-allocine	fr-cls	fr-pawxx	fr-swiss-judgement	fr-tweet-sentiment	fr-xnli	fr-xstance	
$s_C$	Agg	IF	0.87	<b>1.00</b>	0.84	0.95	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.81	
		LOF	0.91	<b>1.00</b>	0.95	0.87	0.66	0.82	0.89	
		Mean	<b>0.92</b>	<b>1.00</b>	0.98	0.90	0.67	0.82	0.93	
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.89	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.99</b>	0.98	0.73	0.92	<b>0.95</b>	
		PW	0.91	<b>1.00</b>	0.98	0.88	0.69	0.85	0.93	
		Bas. Last layer	0.89	<b>1.00</b>	0.91	0.86	0.63	0.75	0.76	
Bas. Logits	0.82	0.67	0.64	0.56	0.57	0.58	0.62			
$s_{RW}$	Agg	IF	0.73	0.74	0.95	<b>0.99</b>	0.86	0.89	0.80	
		LOF	0.63	0.77	0.68	0.85	0.72	0.77	0.67	
		Mean	0.71	0.76	0.88	0.93	0.79	0.83	0.83	
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.71	0.75	0.96	0.86	0.84	0.83	0.84	
		PW	0.67	0.59	0.65	0.74	0.66	0.71	0.60	
		Bas. Last layer	0.81	0.68	0.75	0.58	0.74	0.74	0.63	
Bas. Logits	0.85	0.73	0.78	0.66	0.74	0.76	0.66			
$s_M$	Agg	IF	0.89	0.94	0.95	0.93	0.67	0.86	0.92	
		LOF	0.70	0.87	0.84	0.60	0.78	0.56	0.73	
		Mean	0.63	0.58	0.57	0.65	0.71	0.62	0.54	
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.75	0.82	0.65	0.63	0.71	0.67	0.80	
		PW	0.69	0.69	0.66	0.62	0.76	0.68	0.69	
		Bas. Last layer	0.85	0.90	0.90	0.82	0.63	0.72	0.82	
Bas. Logits	0.64	0.59	0.59	0.58	0.64	0.62	0.62			

Table 17: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation per french IN-DS .

Metric	Ours	out Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$							
			fr-allocine	fr-cls	fr-pawxx	fr-swiss-judgement	fr-tweet-sentiment	fr-xnli	fr-xstance	
$s_C$	Agg	IF	0.51	<b>0.54</b>	0.50	0.51	0.51	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.53</b>	0.50
		LOF	0.50	0.46	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.49
		Mean	0.52	0.48	<b>0.52</b>	0.51	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.51
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	<b>0.52</b>	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.52	<b>0.52</b>	
		PW	0.51	0.48	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.50	
		Bas. Last layer	0.48	0.43	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.48	0.49	
Bas. Logits	0.28	0.29	0.43	0.41	0.40	0.37	0.37			
$s_{RW}$	Agg	IF	0.51	0.50	0.48	<b>0.52</b>	0.50	0.45	0.47	
		LOF	0.38	0.38	0.44	0.50	0.46	0.40	0.37	
		Mean	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.51	0.50	0.42	0.41	
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.47	0.47	0.46	0.51	0.50	0.43	0.43	
		PW	0.35	0.35	0.41	0.37	0.41	0.37	0.37	
		Bas. Last layer	0.40	0.40	0.42	0.41	0.43	0.40	0.39	
Bas. Logits	0.39	0.39	0.45	0.43	0.43	0.42	0.40			
$s_M$	Agg	IF	0.48	0.48	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.49	
		LOF	0.41	0.40	0.44	0.50	0.46	0.38	0.40	
		Mean	0.35	0.36	0.37	0.42	0.34	0.31	0.34	
	Agg <sub>0</sub>	Median	0.38	0.39	0.46	0.48	0.51	0.33	0.37	
		PW	0.35	0.36	0.45	0.46	0.44	0.34	0.35	
		Bas. Last layer	0.43	0.42	0.48	0.50	0.48	0.46	0.47	
Bas. Logits	0.34	0.34	0.37	0.38	0.33	0.29	0.33			

Table 18: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation methods per french OUT-DS .

Metric	Ours	in Agg.	es-cine	es-pawsx	es-tweet-inde	es-tweet-sentiment
$s_C$	Agg	IF	<b>1.00</b>	0.87	<b>0.98</b>	<b>1.00</b>
		LOF	0.77	0.97	0.84	0.74
	Agg $-\emptyset$	Mean	0.79	0.99	0.85	0.74
		Median	0.86	0.99	0.82	0.72
		PW	0.84	0.99	0.85	0.73
	Bas.	Last layer	0.63	0.97	0.75	0.69
Logits		0.60	0.74	0.70	0.58	
$s_{IRW}$	Agg	IF	0.84	0.98	0.77	0.62
		LOF	0.60	0.67	0.61	0.58
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.89	0.96	0.67	0.64
		Median	0.86	<b>0.99</b>	0.66	0.62
		PW	0.72	0.83	0.57	0.59
	Bas.	Last layer	0.66	0.69	0.61	0.59
Logits		0.72	0.73	0.74	0.58	
$s_M$	Agg	IF	0.92	0.96	0.83	0.69
		LOF	0.77	0.80	0.69	0.72
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.53	0.57	0.55	0.66
		Median	0.90	0.63	0.73	0.56
		PW	0.67	0.71	0.74	0.70
	Bas.	Last layer	0.69	0.85	0.83	0.70
Logits		0.58	0.67	0.55	0.66	

Table 19: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation per spanish IN-DS .

Metric	Ours	out Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$			
			es-cine	es-pawsx	es-tweet-inde	es-tweet-sentiment
$s_C$	Agg	IF	0.50	<b>0.50</b>	0.50	<b>0.53</b>
		LOF	0.50	0.49	0.48	0.48
	Agg $-\emptyset$	Mean	0.51	0.49	0.49	0.49
		Median	0.50	0.49	0.49	0.49
		PW	<b>0.51</b>	0.49	0.49	0.49
	Bas.	Last layer	0.49	0.43	0.48	0.47
Logits		0.38	0.38	0.38	0.39	
$s_{IRW}$	Agg	IF	0.47	0.43	0.49	0.49
		LOF	0.26	0.35	0.37	0.37
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.45	0.43	0.51	0.51
		Median	0.48	0.41	<b>0.51</b>	0.50
		PW	0.41	0.31	0.43	0.46
	Bas.	Last layer	0.32	0.32	0.34	0.37
Logits		0.37	0.42	0.37	0.39	
$s_M$	Agg	IF	0.47	0.50	0.49	0.50
		LOF	0.36	0.41	0.41	0.42
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.35	0.31	0.33	0.32
		Median	0.36	0.48	0.45	0.44
		PW	0.38	0.44	0.38	0.38
	Bas.	Last layer	0.45	0.47	0.43	0.44
Logits		0.40	0.35	0.30	0.32	

Table 20: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation methods per spanish OUT-DS .

Metric	Ours	in Agg.	de-pawsx	de-swiss-judgement	de-tweet-sentiment	de-xstance
$s_C$	Agg	IF	0.88	0.99	<b>0.99</b>	0.85
		LOF	0.94	0.99	0.74	0.99
	Agg $-\emptyset$	Mean	0.97	1.00	0.76	<b>0.99</b>
		Median	<b>0.99</b>	0.99	0.76	0.99
		PW	0.96	0.99	0.70	0.99
	Bas.	Last layer	0.93	0.99	0.61	0.97
Logits		0.67	0.53	0.55	0.67	
$s_{IRW}$	Agg	IF	0.95	<b>1.00</b>	0.68	0.97
		LOF	0.84	0.98	0.68	0.84
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.93	0.99	0.85	0.93
		Median	0.97	0.99	0.77	0.90
		PW	0.75	0.94	0.63	0.83
	Bas.	Last layer	0.61	0.91	0.80	0.58
Logits		0.71	0.71	0.66	0.68	
$s_M$	Agg	IF	0.95	1.00	0.66	0.99
		LOF	0.85	0.67	0.74	0.69
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.63	0.74	0.60	0.55
		Median	0.73	0.79	0.66	0.95
		PW	0.70	0.87	0.68	0.79
	Bas.	Last layer	0.74	0.99	0.61	0.93
Logits		0.68	0.73	0.61	0.61	

Table 21: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation per german IN-DS .

Metric	Ours	out Agg.	AUROC $\uparrow$			
			de-pawxs	de-swiss-judgement	de-tweet-sentiment	de-xstance
$s_C$	Agg	IF	<b>0.54</b>	0.51	0.50	0.50
		LOF	0.52	0.52	0.50	0.49
	Agg $-\emptyset$	Mean	0.51	0.53	0.50	0.51
		Median	0.51	0.53	0.50	<b>0.53</b>
		PW	0.52	0.54	0.50	0.51
	Bas.	Last layer	0.53	0.51	0.50	0.52
		Logits	0.33	0.33	0.37	0.31
$s_{RW}$	Agg	IF	0.53	0.50	0.50	0.52
		LOF	0.49	0.49	<b>0.50</b>	0.47
	Agg $\emptyset$	Mean	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.49
		Median	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.52
		PW	0.48	0.39	0.47	0.47
	Bas.	Last layer	0.45	0.41	0.42	0.50
		Logits	0.35	0.40	0.39	0.42
$s_M$	Agg	IF	0.52	<b>0.54</b>	0.50	0.52
		LOF	0.36	0.49	0.44	0.35
	Agg $\emptyset$	Mean	0.34	0.38	0.40	0.34
		Median	0.46	0.48	0.49	0.35
		PW	0.44	0.37	0.45	0.46
	Bas.	Last layer	0.52	0.46	0.50	0.48
		Logits	0.34	0.36	0.37	0.46

Table 22: Performance (AUROC  $\uparrow$ ) of different aggregation methods per german OUT-DS .

Metric	Ours	Agg	clink	hint3
$s_C$	Agg	$s_C$	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.97</b>
		IF	1.00	0.95
		LOF	0.89	0.77
		$s_M$	0.89	0.76
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.90	0.78
		Median	0.90	0.76
		PW	0.91	0.78
	Bas.	Last layer	0.88	0.77
		Logits	0.87	0.71
	$s_{IRW}$	Agg	$s_C$	0.96
IF			0.75	0.77
LOF			0.53	0.51
$s_M$			0.72	0.50
Agg $_{\emptyset}$		Mean	0.78	0.50
		Median	0.65	0.50
		PW	0.60	0.50
Bas.		Last layer	0.59	0.50
		Logits	0.60	0.50
$s_M$		Agg	$s_C$	0.96
	IF		0.90	0.68
	LOF		0.79	0.69
	$s_M$		0.90	0.80
	Agg $_{\emptyset}$	Mean	0.66	0.67
		Median	0.66	0.61
		PW	0.76	0.68
	Bas.	Last layer	0.77	0.72
		Logits	0.79	0.70

Table 23: Performance of our aggregation methods on Clink and Hint3 datasets.

		$s_C, s_C$	$s_C, s_M$	$s_C, \text{Last layer}$	$s_M, s_M$	$s_M, \text{IF}$	$s_M, \text{Last layer}$
cifar10	TNR	78.1	39.5	78.0	34.7	11.7	79.3
	ROC	94.5	84.7	95.8	82.9	80.4	96.0
svhn	TNR	74.4	63.7	76.1	83.8	97.6	82.9
	ROC	92.3	93.2	94.6	97.1	99.3	96.0
isun	TNR	61.0	83.9	62.5	98.0	98.8	64.3
	ROC	90.7	96.8	92.7	99.5	99.6	93.6
lsun_c	TNR	73.7	66.7	74.9	96.5	99.1	80.7
	ROC	94.1	93.7	95.5	99.1	99.5	96.4
lsun_r	TNR	64.3	88.8	65.0	99.2	99.4	70.0
	ROC	91.5	97.6	93.3	99.8	99.7	94.4
tiny_imagenet_c	TNR	71.9	84.0	73.0	99.6	99.9	76.5
	ROC	93.1	96.8	94.5	99.8	99.9	95.4
tiny_imagenet_r	TNR	68.5	87.9	70.1	97.8	98.7	72.5
	ROC	92.7	97.5	93.9	99.5	99.6	94.6
textures	TNR	92.3	99.6	93.0	100.0	100.0	97.4
	ROC	98.4	99.8	98.4	100.0	100.0	99.2
places365	TNR	68.3	90.8	70.4	100.0	100.0	81.2
	ROC	92.3	98.0	94.5	100.0	100.0	96.6
english_chars	TNR	82.1	79.6	82.9	92.8	98.7	90.0
	ROC	94.1	95.9	95.6	98.5	99.6	97.5