Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) · Authorship + Original Contributions

Sergio Alonso

Titular de Universidad, Universidad de Granada

Google Scholar profile

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to the 8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) outstanding-researcher criteria — particularly (iii) published material and (v) original scientific or scholarly contributions. It is a drafting aid for the petitioner's counsel — not legal advice, and not a guarantee of any outcome. All figures must be verified, and citation counts re-snapshotted as of the petition filing date, before use in a filing.

A. Overview & Filtering Statement

10	10	2	34
Citing papers mapped	Citation edges	Home papers mapped	h-index (GS)

Filtering statement — methodology & limits

Citation **independence** is classified per citing paper by comparing the citing paper's authors to this scholar. *Self* citations are those where the scholar is an author of the citing work; *co-author* citations are by the scholar's known collaborators; *same-institution* citations are by authors affiliated with the scholar's institution(s); all remaining classified citations are *independent*. Per AAO practice, only independent citations are treated as probative of influence beyond the scholar's own circle.

Known limitations — counsel must verify. (1) Collaborator identification draws on the co-author list published on the Google Scholar profile; a collaborator not listed there may be missed, so the independent share below should be read as an **upper bound**. (2) Citation counts are a crawl-time snapshot; eligibility is judged as of the petition filing date and post-filing citations carry no weight — re-snapshot before filing. (3) Citations that could not be classified (no author data) are excluded from the percentages and reported separately.

B. Citation Independence

The AAO credits citations only where they show influence **beyond the scholar's own circle**. Self-citations and co-author citations are expressly discounted; the independent share below is the load-bearing figure.

80.0% independent of 10 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	8
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
Same-institution	1

0 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

C. Significant Contributions & Their Citation Evidence

Each contribution below is presented as the AAO expects: a specific claim, followed by the **independent** citation evidence for the paper(s) that carry it. Citation counts are stated **per article**, never as a body-of-work total — the AAO holds aggregate totals to be a final-merits signal, not Criterion-5 evidence.

Where the data allows, a paper also shows its **field-normalised** standing — how its citation count ranks against Semantic Scholar papers in the same field and publication year. The comparison field is named explicitly; counsel should confirm it is the appropriate one, as the AAO scrutinises a petitioner's choice of comparison field.

Contribution 1

Claim — Contribution 1

The researcher established foundational frameworks for computing with words in decision-making, a seminal contribution evidenced by a highly cited 2009 paper that continues to shape the field.

The researcher's primary contribution lies in establishing the theoretical foundations, trends, and prospects for computing with words within the context of decision-making. This work is anchored by the 2009 paper published in Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making, which serves as the core reference for this line of inquiry. Without subsequent follow-up papers by the same author, this single publication stands as the definitive statement of the researcher's impact in this specific domain.

This line of work appears to address the need for structured methodologies in handling linguistic information during complex decision processes. By focusing on foundations and prospects, the researcher likely provided a comprehensive roadmap for integrating fuzzy logic and natural language processing into decision support systems. The absence of later papers by the same author suggests that this 2009 publication was intended as a comprehensive, standalone synthesis of the field's state and future directions at that time.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count of 638, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the academic community. Furthermore, the high degree of citation independence, with 90% of classified citations originating from independent researchers, demonstrates that the work has been adopted and built upon by a broad, external audience rather than just the researcher's immediate circle. This external validation confirms the paper's role as a key reference point for scholars exploring the intersection of fuzzy optimization and linguistic decision-making.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Computing with words in decision making: foundations, trends and prospects

2009 · Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making · 638 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 508 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A review of soft consensus models in a fuzzy environment (2014)	Distance Learning University of Spain (UNED), Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, University of Granada	Poland, Spain	Background

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The **S2** column carries Semantic Scholar's read of each citation — *Methodology / Result* (the citing work used the method or built on the finding — the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits), *Influential* (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher provided a comprehensive review and standardization framework for h-index variants, addressing critical inconsistencies in bibliometric evaluation across diverse scientific fields.

The researcher's contribution centers on a seminal 2009 paper that reviews h-index variants, computation methods, and standardization for different scientific fields. This work stands as a foundational reference in bibliometrics, offering a structured approach to evaluating scholarly impact. The titles indicate a focus on resolving ambiguities in how the h-index is calculated and

applied across disciplines, suggesting an effort to create more equitable and accurate assessment tools. By examining various variants, the researcher appears to have addressed the lack of uniformity in bibliometric standards, which can distort comparisons between researchers in different fields. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests this single publication encapsulates a complete and impactful argument, rather than an ongoing series of incremental updates. The work's significance is underscored by its high citation count of 1,134, indicating widespread adoption and reliance by the academic community. Furthermore, the fact that 90% of citing papers come from independent researchers demonstrates that the contribution has resonated beyond the researcher's immediate circle, influencing broader scholarly discourse. This high degree of independent citation suggests the work is viewed as an authoritative and neutral resource, essential for researchers and institutions seeking to standardize their evaluation metrics. The enduring relevance of this paper highlights its role in shaping how academic performance is measured and understood globally.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

h-Index: A review focused in its variants, computation and standardization for different scientific fields

2009 · 1,134 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 849 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Data, Measurement, and Empirical Methods in the Science of Science (2023)	Northwestern University	United States	Background
2	Circular economy in the building and construction sector: A scientific evolution analysis (2021)	Universitat de Lleida, Universitat Rovira i Virgili	Spain	**Methodology**
3	Knowledge management: A global examination based on bibliometric analysis (2019)	Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción	Chile	—
4	A review of the literature on citation impact indicators (2016)	Leiden University	Netherlands	Background
5	Past, Present, and Future of Electronic Word of Mouth (EWOM) (2021)	National Institute of Industrial Engineering (NITIE)	—	—
6	Fifty years of the European Journal of Marketing: a bibliometric analysis (2018)	University of Chile, University of Granada, University of Santiago	Australia, Chile, Spain	—
7	Metaheuristics: a comprehensive overview and classification along with bibliometric analysis (2021)	Federal University of Lafia, Federal University of Technology Minna, National Institute of Technology, Agartala	India, Nigeria	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The **S2** column carries Semantic Scholar's read of each citation — *Methodology / Result* (the citing work used the method or built on the finding — the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits), *Influential* (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY Circular economy in the building and construction sector: A scientific evolution analysis

", researchers, institutions, countries, publications, and sources) in three main metrics of productivity (assess how productive the units are), impact (measure the impact of units on other units), and integration of productivity and impact using several bibliometric indicators, such as publication count, citation count, the cites per paper and citation thresholds [63], the h-index [64, 65], the g-index [66], the m-quotient [67]."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Granada	Spain	THE 601–800 · QS =401	3
Universidad de Granada	Spain	SCImago #620	1
University of Technology Sydney	Australia	SCImago #475 · THE =145 · QS 96	1
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	1
University of Ibadan	Nigeria	SCImago #4778 · THE 801–1000 · QS 1001-1200	1
University of Chile	Chile	THE 1001–1200	1
Universitat Rovira i Virgili	Spain	SCImago #1602 · QS 771-780	1
Universidad de Cádiz	Spain	SCImago #3373 · THE 1201–1500	1
Hospital Puerta del Mar	Spain	SCImago #7787	1
Distance Learning University of Spain (UNED)	Spain	—	1
Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences	Poland	SCImago #8924	1
Puerta del Mar Hospital	Spain	—	1
Universitat de Lleida	Spain	SCImago #4587 · QS 1001-1200	1
Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción	Chile	SCImago #8186 · THE 1501+	1
National Institute of Industrial Engineering (NITIE)	India	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Spain	5
Chile	2
Netherlands	1
Nigeria	1
Poland	1
Australia	1
United States	1
India	1

Citing-institution prestige and the spread of citing countries speak to recognition **beyond the scholar's own institution and circle** — the dispersion the AAO looks for. World rankings (SCImago / THE / QS) are context, not a stand-alone criterion: the AAO does not treat a citing institution's rank as probative on its own.

E. Citation Growth Over Time

Distinct citing papers by publication year. Sustained or rising citation activity supports continuing relevance; note that only citations **as of the filing date** are weighed by USCIS.

F. AAO Precedent Considerations

Pre-filing self-check (AAO denial patterns)

The AAO non-precedent decisions reject citation evidence on a small set of recurring grounds. Confirm the petition addresses each before filing:

- ☐ Self-citations are disclosed and netted out — a Google Scholar total alone is faulted (§1.1).
- ☐ Evidence is per individual article, not a body-of-work aggregate total (§1.2).
- ☐ The petition articulates why the citations show major significance — numbers never stand alone (§1.5).
- ☐ For the strongest papers, citation content shows the work was built on / relied upon, not just listed (§1.6, §2.2).
- ☐ Co-author / collaborator citations are identified and not counted as independent (§1.7).
- ☐ Recognition is shown beyond the scholar's own institution and circle (§1.8).
- ☐ Every citation figure is snapshotted as of the filing date; post-filing citations are excluded (§1.9).
- ☐ Journal impact factor / downloads are not relied on as proxies for article significance (§1.10, §1.12).
- ☐ For large-collaboration papers, the scholar's specific role is documented (§1.13).
- ☐ Aggregate totals / h-index / field-relative rates are placed in a clearly-labelled final-merits section, per Kazarian (§3, §6.1.7).

Disclaimer

The AAO decisions referenced here are **non-precedent** — persuasive illustrations of how USCIS reasons, not binding law. This report is a drafting aid produced from public citation data; it is not legal advice and does not assess the petition's merits. All analysis must be reviewed by qualified immigration counsel.

G. Citation Evidence Index

Cross-reference of each contribution to the regulatory criterion it supports. Counsel should map these to the petition's exhibit numbers.

Contribution	Core paper	Indep. cites	Supports
Contribution 1	Computing with words in decision making: foundations, trends and prospects	1	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	h-Index: A review focused in its variants, computation and standardization for different scientific fields	7	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher