

L^AT_EX Author Guidelines for CVWW 2012 Proceedings

Anonymous CVWW submission

Paper ID ****

Abstract. *This document gives a specification for the paper layout for submission to the Computer Vision Winter Workshop 2012. The template is based on the CVPR 2012 template. This document is written in accordance to the specification and guidelines, and hence may be used as an example of how a paper should look like.*

1. Introduction

Please follow the steps outlined below when submitting your manuscript to the CVWW. This style guide now has several important modifications (for example, you are no longer warned against the use of sticky tape to attach your artwork to the paper), so all authors should read this new version.

2. General information

The reviewing process will be double-blind. The papers are expected to present novel work. Accepted papers will be published in the workshop proceedings. Authors will be given an opportunity to withdraw their paper from the proceedings so that no restrictions on submitting the work to other conferences and journals is imposed. If the paper is published in the workshop proceedings, it will also be available for download on our webpage.

For cost reasons, the conference proceedings will not be printed in color. If you submit documents with color figures, the printed result may not meet your expectations, so color elements should be converted to gray-scale. Original papers will be scaled to 80% and printed with a final resolution of 300 DPI. Therefore, the use of higher resolutions is unnecessary. Also, do not use too thin lines, since in the worst case they won't be visible. Use lines with a width of at least 0.2 pt (as recommended by the printing service).

2.1. Language

All manuscripts must be in English.

2.2. Paper length

CVWW papers may be between 6 pages and 8 pages. Overlength papers will simply not be reviewed. This includes papers where the margins and formatting are deemed to have been significantly altered from those laid down by this style guide.

2.3. The ruler

The L^AT_EX style defines a printed ruler which should be present in the version submitted for review. The ruler is provided in order that reviewers may comment on particular lines in the paper without circumlocution. The presence or absence of the ruler should not change the appearance of any other content on the page. The camera ready copy should not contain a ruler. (Users should uncomment the `\cvwwfinalcopy` command in the document preamble.)

2.4. Mathematics

Please number all of your sections and displayed equations. It is important for readers to be able to refer to any particular equation. Just because you didn't refer to it in the text doesn't mean some future reader might not need to refer to it. It is cumbersome to have to use circumlocutions like "the equation second from the top of page 3 column 1". (Note that the ruler will not be present in the final copy, so is not an alternative to equation numbers). All authors will benefit from reading Mermin's description of how to write mathematics ¹.

¹<http://cvww2012.vicos.si/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/mermin.pdf>

2.5. Blind review

Many authors misunderstand the concept of anonymizing for blind review. Blind review does not mean that one must remove citations to one's own work—in fact it is often impossible to review a paper unless the previous citations are known and available.

Blind review means that you do not use the words “my” or “our” when citing previous work. That is all (but see below for techreports).

Saying “this builds on the work of Lucy Smith [1]” does not say that you are Lucy Smith, it says that you are building on her work. If you are Smith and Jones, do not say “as we show in [7]”, say “as Smith and Jones show in [7]” and at the end of the paper, include reference 7 as you would any other cited work.

An example of a bad paper just asking to be rejected:

An analysis of the frobnicatable foo filter.

In this paper we present a performance analysis of our previous paper [1], and show it to be inferior to all previously known methods. Why the previous paper was accepted without this analysis is beyond me.

[1] Removed for blind review

An example of an acceptable paper:

An analysis of the frobnicatable foo filter.

In this paper we present a performance analysis of the paper of Smith *et al.* [1], and show it to be inferior to all previously known methods. Why the previous paper was accepted without this analysis is beyond me.

[1] Smith, L and Jones, C. “The frobnicatable foo filter, a fundamental contribution to human knowledge”. Nature 381(12), 1-213.

If you are making a submission to another conference at the same time, which covers similar or overlapping material, you may need to refer to that submission in order to explain the differences, just as you would if you had previously published related work. In such cases, include the anonymized parallel submission [5] as additional material and cite it as

[1] Authors. “The frobnicatable foo filter”, F&G 2011 Submission ID 324, Supplied as additional material fg324.pdf.

Finally, you may feel you need to tell the reader that more details can be found elsewhere, and refer them to a technical report. For conference submissions, the paper must stand on its own, and not *require* the reviewer to go to a techreport for further details. Thus, you may say in the body of the paper “further details may be found in [4]”. Then submit the techreport as additional material. Again, you may not assume the reviewers will read this material.

Sometimes your paper is about a problem which you tested using a tool which is widely known to be restricted to a single institution. For example, let's say it's 1969, you have solved a key problem on the Apollo lander, and you believe that the CVWW 1970 audience would like to hear about your solution. The work is a development of your celebrated 1968 paper entitled “Zero-g frobnication: How being the only people in the world with access to the Apollo lander source code makes us a wow at parties”, by Zeus *et al.*

You can handle this paper like any other. Don't write “We show how to improve our previous work [Anonymous, 1968]. This time we tested the algorithm on a lunar lander [name of lander removed for blind review]”. That would be silly, and would immediately identify the authors. Instead write the following:

We describe a system for zero-g frobnication. This system is new because it handles the following cases: A, B. Previous systems [Zeus *et al.* 1968] didn't handle case B properly. Ours handles it by including a foo term in the bar integral.

...

The proposed system was integrated with the Apollo lunar lander, and went all the way to the moon, don't you know. It displayed the following behaviours which show how well we solved cases A and B:

...

As you can see, the above text follows standard scientific convention, reads better than the first version, and does not explicitly name you as the authors. A reviewer might think it likely that the new paper was written by Zeus *et al.*, but cannot make any decision based on that guess. He or she would have to be sure that no other authors could have been contracted to solve problem B.

Location	Year	Attendees
St. Lambrecht, Austria	2007	43
Moravske Toplice, Slovenija	2008	46
Eibiswald, Austria	2009	41
Nove Hrad, Czech Republic	2010	52
Mittlerberg, Austria	2011	52

Table 1. Number of attendees over the last years.



Figure 1. The logo of CVWW2012.

2.6. Color

Color is valuable, and will be visible to readers of the electronic copy. However ensure that, when printed on a monochrome printer, no important information is lost by the conversion to grayscale.

2.7. Examples

Figure 1 shows the logo of the CVWW 2012. Table 1 shows the number of participants of the CVWW over the last years.

One could cite works on Frobnication [1, 2], or work of Alpher *et al.* [3].

2.8. Supplementary Material

You can include additional material (*e.g.*, videos, technical reports, papers that are submitted in parallel and needed for reference,...). Supplementary material can be of filetype zip or pdf with a maximum size of 10MByte. Please note that a reviewer may not look at the supplementary material at all.

3. Conclusion

For any questions regarding the style guidelines please contact cvww2012@fri.uni-lj.si. Please do not forget to replace the asterisks in the example pa-

per with your paper's own ID before uploading your file. You receive a paper ID by generating a new submission without adding a file. Submissions can be edited until the deadline.

Acknowledgements

Are acknowledgements OK? Yes, but leave them for the final copy.

References

- [1] A. Alpher. Frobnication. *Journal of Foo*, 12(1):234–778, 2002. 3
- [2] A. Alpher and J. P. N. Fotheringham-Smythe. Frobnication revisited. *Journal of Foo*, 13(1):234–778, 2003. 3
- [3] A. Alpher, J. P. N. Fotheringham-Smythe, and G. Gamow. Can a machine frobnicate? *Journal of Foo*, 14(1):234–778, 2004. 3
- [4] Authors. Frobnication tutorial, 2006. Supplied as additional material `tr.pdf`. 2
- [5] Authors. The frobnicable foo filter, 2011. Face and Gesture submission ID 324. Supplied as additional material `fg324.pdf`. 2