

Author Guidelines for the British Machine Vision Conference

BMVC 2025 Submission # ??

Abstract

This document demonstrates the format requirements for papers submitted to the British Machine Vision Conference. The format is designed for easy on-screen reading, and to print well at one or two pages per sheet. Additional features include: pop-up annotations for citations [1, 2]; a margin ruler for reviewing; and a greatly simplified way of entering multiple authors and institutions.

All authors are encouraged to read this document, even if you have written many papers before. As well as a description of the format, the document contains many instructions relating to formatting problems and errors that are common even in the work of authors who *have* written many papers before.

1 Introduction

From 2009, the proceedings of BMVC (the British Machine Vision Conference) will be published only in electronic form. This document illustrates the required paper format, and includes guidelines on preparation of submissions. Papers which fail to adhere to these requirements may be rejected at any stage in the review process.

L^AT_EX users should use this template in order to prepare their paper. Users of other packages should emulate the style and layout of this example. Note that best results will be achieved using pdf_lat_ex, which is available in most modern distributions.

1.1 Paper length

Papers for phase-one review must be 9 pages in length, **only excluding** the bibliography. **All** appendices must be counted within the *9-page limit* or supplied as supplementary material.

Papers which are clearly overlength will 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.

The bibliography should begin immediately after the paper text. It may be of any length, within reason. It should *not* include annotations, figures, or any other paraphernalia intended to subvert the paper length requirement.




Figure 1: It is often a good idea for the first figure to attempt to encapsulate the article, complementing the abstract. This figure illustrates the various print and on-screen layouts for which this paper format has been optimized: (a) traditional BMVC print format; (b) on-screen single-column format, or large-print paper; (c) full-screen two column, or 2-up printing.

1.2 Dual submission

By submitting this manuscript to BMVC, the authors assert that it has not previously published in substantially similar form, and no paper currently under submission to a conference contains significant overlap with this one. If you are in doubt about the amount of overlap, cite the dual submission (as described below), and argue in the body of your paper why this is a nontrivial advance. A simultaneous journal submission would be expected to have significant additional material not in the conference paper, and should not be previously published, nor in the final acceptance stages. The conference chairs reserve the right to cancel submission of any paper which is found to violate these conditions. In particular, *uncited* dual submissions will be summarily dealt with.

1.3 Anonymity and blind review

BMVC operates a double-blind review process. Your review submission **must not identify you as the author**. This means, in particular, that the author list should be replaced by the words “BMVC YYYY Submission # NNN”, where the italics are to indicate the year and the submission number. The provided `LATEX` command `\bmvcreviewcopy` does this automatically. In addition, acknowledgements should not be included in the review copy.

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:

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 excellent 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 will almost certainly need to refer to that submission in order to explain the differences, just as you would if you or others had previously published related work. In such cases, include the anonymized parallel submission [■] as additional material and cite it as

[1] Authors. “The frobnicatable foo filter”, ECCV 2006 Submission ID 324, Supplied as additional material `eccv06.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 [■]”. 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 ICLL’70 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




Figure 2: Example of a short caption, which should be centered.

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.

FAQ: Are acknowledgements OK? No. Leave them for the final copy.

1.4 Citations

When citing a multi-author paper, you may save space by using “*et alia*”, shortened to “*et al.*” (not “*et. al.*” as “*et*” is a complete word.) The provided `\etal` macro is a useful *aide memoire* in this regard. However, use it only when there are three or more authors. Thus, the following is correct: “Frobnication has been trendy lately. It was introduced by Alpher [1], and subsequently developed by Alpher and Fotheringham-Smythe [2], and Alpher *et al.* [3].”

This is incorrect: “... subsequently developed by Alpher *et al.* [2] ...” because reference [2] has just two authors. If you use the `\etal` macro, then you need not worry about double periods when used at the end of a sentence as in Alpher *et al.*

We use `natbib`, so citations in random order are nicely sorted: [1, 2, 3, 4]. However, we don’t use the `compress` option, as we want each reference to have its own hyperlink and popup window.

1.5 Footnotes

Please use footnotes¹ sparingly. Indeed, try to avoid footnotes altogether and include necessary peripheral observations in the text (within parentheses, if you prefer, as in this sentence). If you wish to use a footnote, place it at the bottom of the column on the page on which it is referenced. Use Times 8-point type, single-spaced.

1.6 The ruler

The \LaTeX 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

¹This is what a footnote looks like. It often distracts the reader from the main flow of the argument.

Method	Frobnability
Theirs	Frumpy
Yours	Frobbly
Ours	Makes one's heart Frob

Table 1: Results. Ours is better.

paper without circumlocation. If you are preparing a document using a non- \LaTeX document preparation system, please arrange for an equivalent ruler to appear on the final output pages. 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. (\LaTeX users may remove the `[review]` option from the `\documentclass` statement.) Reviewers: note that the ruler measurements do not align well with lines in the paper — this turns out to be very difficult to do well when the paper contains many figures and equations, and, when done, looks ugly. Just use fractional references (e.g. this line is 210.5), although in most cases one would expect that the approximate location (210 in the previous example) will be adequate.

1.7 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 [5] of how to write mathematics.

1.8 References

List and number all bibliographical references in 9-point Times, single-spaced, at the end of your paper. When referenced in the text, enclose the citation number in square brackets, for example [1]. Where appropriate, include the name(s) of editors of referenced books.

1.9 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.

References

[1] A. Alpher. Frobnication. *Journal of Foo*, 12(1):234–778, 2002.

[2] A. Alpher and J. P. N. Fotheringham-Smythe. Frobnication revisited. *Journal of Foo*, 13(1):234–778, 2003.

[3] A. Alpher, J. P. N. Fotheringham-Smythe, and G. Gamow. Can a machine frobnicate? *Journal of Foo*, 14(1):234–778, 2004.

-
- [4] Authors. The frobnicatable foo filter, 2006. ECCV06 submission ID 324. Supplied as additional material `eccv06.pdf`. 230
231
232
- [5] Authors. Frobnication tutorial, 2006. Supplied as additional material `tr.pdf`. 233
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
- [6] N. David Mermin. What’s wrong with these equations? *Physics Today*, October 1989. <http://www.cvpr.org/doc/mermin.pdf>. 234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275