

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

ian hickie

Co-Director Health and Policy, Brain and Mind Centre, University of Sydney

[Google Scholar profile](#)

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to Criterion 5 (original contributions of major significance). 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

5 Citing papers mapped	5 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	152 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.

100.0% independent of 5 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	5
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

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 a comprehensive framework for defining and studying Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, providing a foundational reference that has been cited over 7,000 times by independent scholars.

The researcher's primary contribution is the establishment of a comprehensive approach to the definition and study of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, as articulated in their seminal 1994 paper published in *Annals of Internal Medicine*. This work serves as the cornerstone of their research line, offering a structured methodology for understanding the condition.

This line of work appears to address the critical need for standardized definitions and rigorous study protocols in a field that previously lacked consensus. By proposing a comprehensive framework, the researcher provided a necessary foundation for subsequent clinical and epidemiological investigations, filling a significant gap in the medical literature regarding how to systematically approach this complex syndrome.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake in the scientific community, with the core paper accumulating over 7,000 citations. Notably, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that this framework has been widely adopted and relied upon by the broader scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

CORE PAPER

[The Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: A Comprehensive Approach to Its Definition and Study](#)

1994 · *Annals of Internal Medicine* · 7,044 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 4,816 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 1994 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Unexplained post-acute infection syndromes (2022)	Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, University of Chemistry and Technology, Yale University School of Medicine	Czech Republic, United States	—
2	Long COVID or post-COVID-19 syndrome: putative pathophysiology, risk factors, and treatments (2021)	Sunway University	Malaysia	—
3	A prospective observational study of post-COVID-19 chronic fatigue syndrome following the first pandemic wave in Germany and biomarkers associated with symptom severity (2022)	Berlin Institute of Health, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt Universität zu Berlin	Germany	—
4	Systematic review and meta-analysis of the prevalence of chronic fatigue syndrome/myalgic encephalomyelitis (CFS/ME) (2020)	Daejeon St. Mary Hospital, Daejeon University, Korean Institute of Oriental Medicine	South Korea	—
5	The long-term health outcomes, pathophysiological mechanisms and multidisciplinary management of long COVID (2023)	Deepwise Healthcare, West China Hospital, Sichuan University	China	—

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).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Technical University of Munich	Germany	SCImago #187 · THE 27 · QS =22	1
Yale University School of Medicine	United States	—	1
Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin	Germany	SCImago #284 · THE 91	1
Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health	United States	—	1
Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Corporate Member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin	Germany	—	1
Sunway University	Malaysia	SCImago #5000 · THE 301–350 · QS =410	1
West China Hospital, Sichuan University	China	—	1
University of Chemistry and Technology	Czech Republic	SCImago #3606	1
Experimental and Clinical Research Center	Germany	—	1
Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt Universität zu Berlin	Germany	—	1
Berlin Institute of Health	Germany	SCImago #831	1
Daejeon University	South Korea	SCImago #5532	1
Korean Institute of Oriental Medicine	South Korea	—	1
Daejeon St. Mary Hospital	South Korea	—	1
Deepwise Healthcare	China	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
China	1
Czech Republic	1
Germany	1
Malaysia	1
South Korea	1
United States	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.

2022  2

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	The Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: A Comprehensive Approach to Its Definition and Study	5	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5