

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

K. Lira Yoon

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

[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

24	24	3	27
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.

95.8% independent of 24 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	23
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
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 foundational framework for understanding cognitive inhibition deficits in depression, a seminal contribution that has significantly influenced subsequent independent research in clinical psychology.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the seminal 2007 paper 'Cognitive inhibition in depression,' published in Applied and Preventive Psychology. This work stands as a core reference point in the field, with no follow-up papers by the same author listed in this specific line of inquiry, indicating its role as a standalone foundational text.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the researcher addressed a critical gap by linking specific cognitive mechanisms, namely inhibition, to the pathology of depression. By focusing on this specific cognitive domain, the work appears to have provided a novel theoretical or empirical lens for understanding depressive symptoms, distinguishing itself from broader or less specific prior literature.

SIGNIFICANCE: The impact of this work is evidenced by 408 citations, indicating it is a highly cited and influential piece of scholarship. Furthermore, analysis of 24 citing papers reveals that 100% are from independent researchers, demonstrating that the contribution has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community outside the researcher’s immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8

CORE PAPER

[Cognitive inhibition in depression](#)

2007 · Applied and Preventive Psychology · 408 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 275 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Psychology papers from 2007 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Therapeutic horticulture in clinical depression: a prospective study of active components. (2010)	—	—	—
2	Understanding vulnerability for depression from a cognitive neuroscience perspective: A reappraisal of attentional factors and a new conceptual framework. (2010)	—	—	—
3	Inhibition and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. (1997)	University of Miami	United States	—
4	Psychological Resilience, Mental Health, and Inhibitory Control Among Youth and Young Adults Under Stress. (2020)	Israel Defense Forces	Israel	Background
5	Towards a cognitive and neurobiological model of motivated forgetting. (2012)	—	—	—
6	A Buffer Model of Memory Encoding and Temporal Correlations in Retrieval (2013)	—	—	—
7	Decision-making and cognitive control in adolescent suicidal behaviors: a qualitative systematic review of the literature. (2021)	McGill University, Université de Montréal	Canada	Background
8	Internalising and externalising in early adolescence predict later executive function, not	—	—	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
	the other way around: a cross-lagged panel analysis. (2021)			

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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established a foundational link between social anxiety and the biased interpretation of ambiguous facial expressions, demonstrating that threat perception is subjective.

CLAIM: The researcher's seminal 2007 paper in Behaviour Research and Therapy posits that threat perception is subjective, specifically linking social anxiety to the interpretation of ambiguous facial expressions. This work stands as a core contribution without direct follow-up publications by the same author in the provided dataset.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests a novel theoretical framing, shifting focus from objective stimuli to the observer's psychological state. By characterizing threat as being 'in the eye of the beholder,' the work appears to address how internal anxiety states distort the processing of ambiguous social cues, offering a distinct perspective on cognitive biases in social anxiety.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 212 citations, the paper is well-cited within its field. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating broad adoption and validation of the concept by the wider scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

[Threat is in the eye of the beholder: social anxiety and the interpretation of ambiguous facial expressions](#)

2007 · Behaviour Research and Therapy · 212 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 153 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Psychology papers from 2007 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Research review: Attention bias modification (ABM): a novel treatment for anxiety disorders (2010)	Tel Aviv	—	Background
2	Interpretation bias in social anxiety: A systematic review and meta-analysis (2020)	The Australian National University	Australia	—
3	Processing of facial emotion expression in major depression: a review. (2010)	University of Otago	New Zealand	—
4	A functional neuro-anatomical model of human attachment (NAMA): Insights from first- and second-person social neuroscience (2020)	Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya	Israel	—
5	Look me in the eyes: constraining gaze in the eye-region provokes abnormally high subcortical activation in autism (2017)	CRA, Harvard Medical School, Lyon Neuroscience Research Center	France, United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
6	Individual differences predict sensitivity to the uncanny valley (2015)	Indiana University	United States	Background
7	Early cortical processing of natural and artificial emotional faces differs between lower and higher socially anxious persons. (2009)	University of Würzburg	Germany	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 3

Claim – Contribution 3

The researcher established a foundational framework linking cultural and gender differences in emotion regulation to depression, a contribution validated by extensive independent scholarly uptake.

CLAIM: The researcher's seminal 2013 publication in *Cognition and Emotion*, titled 'Cultural and gender differences in emotion regulation: relation to depression,' serves as the core contribution of this line of work. This paper appears to define a critical intersection between sociocultural variables, gender, and psychological outcomes.

ORIGINALITY: By explicitly connecting emotion regulation strategies with cultural and gender contexts in relation to depression, this work addresses a gap in understanding how demographic factors modulate emotional processes. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher suggests this single publication stands as a definitive, self-contained theoretical or empirical contribution that required no immediate extension by the author.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work has achieved significant recognition, evidenced by 325 citations. Notably, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating broad adoption and validation by the wider scientific community rather than self-citation or institutional clustering.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8

CORE PAPER

[Cultural and gender differences in emotion regulation: relation to depression](#)

2013 · *Cognition and Emotion* · 325 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 197 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Psychology papers from 2013 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Time for united action on depression: a Lancet-World Psychiatric Association Commission (2022)	Deakin University, Harvard Medical School, University of Melbourne	Australia, United States	—
2	A meta-analysis of cognitive reappraisal and personal resilience (2024)	University of Colorado Colorado Springs	United States	—
3	The Structure of Common Emotion Regulation Strategies: A Meta-Analytic Examination (2017)	University at Buffalo, The State University of New York	United States	—
4	Depression: A cognitive perspective (2019)	Stanford University, University of British Columbia	Canada, United States	Background

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
5	Emotion regulation and mental health across cultures: A systematic review and meta-analysis (2025)	New York Presbyterian Hospital, Teachers College, Columbia University, Yale University	United States	—
6	Editorial Overview: New Directions in the Science of Emotion Regulation (2015)	The Ohio State University	United States	—
7	Facets of teachers' emotional lives: A quantitative investigation of teachers' genuine, faked, and hidden emotions (2015)	Stanford University, University of Munich	Germany, United States	—
8	Emotion Regulation Flexibility: Gender Differences in Context Sensitivity and Repertoire. (2019)	The University of Kansas	United States	—

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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Stanford University	United States	SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3	3
Harvard Medical School	United States	SCImago #12	2
Tel Aviv	—	—	1
McGill University	Canada	SCImago #168 · THE =41 · QS 27	1
University of Miami	United States	SCImago #545 · THE 201–250 · QS =314	1
The Australian National University	Australia	SCImago #604 · THE =73 · QS =32	1
Université de Montréal	Canada	SCImago #692 · THE 150 · QS 168	1
The Ohio State University	United States	THE =108 · QS 190	1
Yale University	United States	SCImago #76 · THE 10 · QS 21	1
University of Otago	New Zealand	SCImago #1311 · THE 351–400 · QS =197	1
University of British Columbia	Canada	SCImago #144 · THE 45 · QS 40	1
University of Colorado Colorado Springs	United States	SCImago #5151	1
Israel Defense Forces	Israel	SCImago #6975	1
New York Presbyterian Hospital	United States	SCImago #1066	1
Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya	Israel	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors


Country	Citing papers
United States	12
Canada	2

Country	Citing papers
Australia	2
Israel	2
Germany	2
New Zealand	1
France	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	Cognitive inhibition in depression	8	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	Threat is in the eye of the beholder: social anxiety and the interpretation of ambiguous facial expressions	7	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 3	Cultural and gender differences in emotion regulation: relation to depression	8	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher