

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Sunny Rai

University of Pennsylvania

[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

64 Citing papers mapped	64 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	12 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 1 classified citing papers

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

63 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 demonstrated that multilingual language models fail to capture multicultural nuances in emotion, challenging assumptions about model universality through a focused case study.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2023 paper 'Multilingual Language Models are not Multicultural: A Case Study in Emotion,' published in the Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis (WASSA 2023). This work serves as the foundational claim for this line of research, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in the provided data.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in natural language processing regarding the cultural validity of multilingual models. The title suggests that while these models may handle multiple languages, they do not necessarily understand the cultural contexts embedded within emotional expressions. By framing the issue as a 'case study in emotion,' the researcher likely highlights specific discrepancies where linguistic translation fails to convey culturally specific emotional nuances, thereby questioning the assumption that multilingual capability equates to multicultural competence.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its reception in the academic community. With 114 citations, the paper has garnered substantial attention, indicating that the identified limitation is a recognized and important issue in the field. Furthermore, the citation analysis reveals that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the findings have resonated beyond the researcher's immediate circle and have influenced broader scholarly discourse on model bias and cultural representation.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

[Multilingual Language Models are not Multicultural: A Case Study in Emotion](#)

2023 · Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis (WASSA 2023) · 114 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 95 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Linguistics papers from 2023 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Survey of Cultural Awareness in Language Models: Text and Beyond	KAIST, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Princeton University	Denmark, Netherlands, South Korea	—

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
University of Amsterdam	Netherlands	SCImago #75 · THE =62 · QS 53	1
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	South Korea	SCImago #366 · THE =70	1
University of Copenhagen	Denmark	SCImago #177 · THE 90 · QS 101	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Princeton University	United States	SCImago #386 · THE =3 · QS =25	1
KAIST	South Korea	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Denmark	1
Netherlands	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.

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	Multilingual Language Models are not Multicultural: A Case Study in Emotion	1	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher