Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Zixuan Wang

University of California, San Diego

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

19	28	6	3
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.

64.3% independent of 14 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	9
Self-citation	3
Co-author	2
Same-institution	0

5 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 developed reasoning-enhanced domain-adaptive pretraining for multimodal models to improve short video content governance, extending this framework to agent-driven discovery of emerging issues.

The researcher's core contribution centers on the 2025 paper, 'Reasoning-Enhanced Domain-Adaptive Pretraining of Multimodal Large Language Models for Short Video Content Governance.' This work establishes a foundational approach for adapting multimodal large language models to the specific challenges of governing short video content through enhanced reasoning capabilities.

This line of work appears to address the gap in applying general multimodal models to the specialized, high-volume context of short video platforms. The subsequent 2026 follow-up, 'When Rules Fall Short: Agent-Driven Discovery of Emerging Content Issues in Short Video Platforms,' suggests an evolution from static pretraining to dynamic, agent-driven systems capable of identifying novel content issues that traditional rule-based methods miss.

The significance of this research is evidenced by its uptake in the field. The core paper has garnered 12 citations, while the follow-up has received 3. Notably, 64.3% of the 14 classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that this work has attracted attention and validation from scholars outside the researcher's immediate institution and collaboration network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 9

CORE PAPER

Reasoning-Enhanced Domain-Adaptive Pretraining of Multimodal Large Language Models for Short Video Content Governance

2025 · Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language ..., 2025 · 12 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Semanticvla: Semantic-aligned sparsification and enhancement for efficient robotic manipulation	Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, Huawei	China	—
2	Amas: Adaptively determining communication topology for llm-based multi-agent system	Carnegie Mellon University, Johns Hopkins University, Stanford University	China, United States	—
3	Ft-mdt: Extracting decision trees from medical texts via a novel low-rank adaptation method	Carnegie Mellon University, Johns Hopkins University, Stanford University	China, United States	—
4	Aligning by Misaligning: Boundary-aware Curriculum Learning for Multimodal Alignment	Carnegie Mellon University, Nanjing University, Shanghai Jiao Tong University	China, Hong Kong, United Kingdom	—
5	FAST: A Synergistic Framework of Attention and State-space Models for Spatiotemporal Traffic Prediction	Carnegie Mellon University, Columbia University, New York University	United States	—
6	Making MLLMs Blind: Adversarial Smuggling Attacks in MLLM Content Moderation	Chinese Academy of Sciences Institute of Automation, Hellogroup, Jilin University	China, United States	—
7	Towards Responsible Recommendations: A Daily Updated Ranking Model for Content Issue Detection	Tiktok Inc., TikTok, Inc.	China, United States	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The **S2** column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

FOLLOW-UP WORK

When Rules Fall Short: Agent-Driven Discovery of Emerging Content Issues in Short Video Platforms

2026 · Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2026, 8008-8016, 2026 · 3 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 5 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Computer Science papers from 2026 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	FAST: A Synergistic Framework of Attention and State-space Models for Spatiotemporal Traffic Prediction	Carnegie Mellon University, Columbia University, New York University	United States	—
2	The Role of Generative AI in Economic Research: Enhancing Productivity and Cognitive Automation	Nanchang Institute of Technology	China	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The **S2** column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Tiktok Inc.	United States	—	6
Carnegie Mellon University	United States	SCImago #266 · THE 24 · QS 52	4
Johns Hopkins University	United States	SCImago #33 · THE 16 · QS 24	2
Bytedance Inc.	China	—	2
University of Hong Kong	China	SCImago #195 · THE 33 · QS 11	2
The University of Chicago	United States	SCImago #124 · THE 15 · QS 13	2
TikTok, Inc.	United States	—	2
Stanford University	United States	SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3	2
University of California, Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	1
University of Washington	United States	SCImago #45 · THE 25 · QS 81	1
Columbia University	United States	SCImago #65 · THE 20 · QS =38	1
Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen	China	—	1
Chinese Academy of Sciences Institute of Automation	China	—	1
University of Chicago	United States	SCImago #124 · THE 15 · QS 13	1
Nanjing University	China	SCImago #178 · THE =62 · QS =103	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	12
China	10
Hong Kong	1
United Kingdom	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.

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	Reasoning-Enhanced Domain-Adaptive Pre-training of Multimodal Large Language Models for Short Video Content Governance	9	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher