Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

David Bejou

Unknown affiliation

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	5	23
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.

100.0% independent of 10 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	10
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 foundational framework for tourism destination marketing alliances, a seminal contribution that has garnered significant independent scholarly attention since its publication.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the conceptualization of tourism destination marketing alliances, anchored by a seminal 1995 paper that has accumulated 709 citations. This work stands as a core reference point in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher required to sustain its impact.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the researcher addressed the structural and strategic complexities of collaborative marketing efforts among tourism destinations. By formalizing the concept of 'alliances' in this context, the work likely provided a novel theoretical lens for understanding how disparate entities coordinate promotional activities, filling a gap in early tourism management literature.

SIGNIFICANCE: The enduring relevance of this contribution is evidenced by its high citation count. Notably, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and built upon by the broader academic community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional echo chambers.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

Tourism destination marketing alliances

1995 · 709 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 362 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 1995 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Marketing the competitive destination of the future. (2000)	Bournemouth University	United Kingdom	—
2	Destination Image, Self-Congruity, and Travel Behavior: Toward an Integrative Model (2000)	University of Victoria, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Canada, United States	Background
3	Factors for Success in Rural Tourism Development (2001)	Gustavus Adolphus College, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois Extension	United States	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 pioneered the application of neural network analysis to evaluate buyer-seller relationships, establishing a foundational methodological framework for computational modeling in marketing science.

The researcher's seminal contribution rests on the 1994 paper 'Using neural network analysis to evaluate buyer-seller relationships.' This work represents a distinct line of inquiry that applies computational intelligence techniques to complex interpersonal dynamics within commercial contexts. The titles indicate a focus on leveraging neural networks to assess the nuances of these relationships, suggesting an early integration of advanced algorithmic methods into marketing research.

This line of work appears to address the challenge of quantifying and analyzing the non-linear, complex nature of buyer-seller interactions. By introducing neural network analysis to this domain, the researcher likely provided a novel alternative to traditional statistical methods, offering a more flexible approach to modeling relationship quality and dynamics. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher suggests this core publication stands as a singular, foundational intervention in the field.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 546, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the academic community. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad impact beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network. This high degree of independent uptake confirms the paper's status as a widely adopted reference point for scholars exploring computational approaches to marketing relationships.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Using neural network analysis to evaluate buyer-seller relationships

1994 · 546 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 308 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 1994 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Investments in Consumer Relationships: A Cross-Country and Cross-Industry Exploration (2001)	Ghent University, Maastricht University	Belgium	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 pioneered the application of artificial neural networks to analyze determinants of relationship quality, establishing a foundational computational approach in this domain.

The researcher's core contribution rests on the 1996 paper 'Determinants of relationship quality: an artificial neural network analysis.' This work appears to introduce a novel methodological framework for understanding relationship dynamics through computational modeling.

This line of work addresses the need for advanced analytical techniques in relationship research. By employing artificial neural networks, the researcher likely offered a non-linear, data-driven alternative to traditional statistical methods, suggesting a shift toward more complex modeling of human interactions.

The work has demonstrated significant impact, with the core paper accumulating 552 citations. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the methodology and findings have been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Determinants of relationship quality: an artificial neural network analysis

1996 · 552 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 332 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 1996 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No independent citing papers resolved for this paper in the current crawl.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Ghent University	Belgium	SCImago #330 · THE 115 · QS 162	1
Bournemouth University	United Kingdom	SCImago #2816 · THE 401–500 · QS 801-850	1
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	SCImago #206 · THE =41	1
Maastricht University	Netherlands	SCImago #783 · THE =131 · QS 239	1
Islamic University of Science and Technology	India	SCImago #8437	1
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	United States	SCImago #534 · THE 251–300 · QS =358	1
Gustavus Adolphus College	United States	—	1
University of Illinois Extension	United States	—	1
Bandirma Onyedi Eylul University	Turkey	—	1
Batman University	Turkey	SCImago #8278	1
University of Victoria	Canada	SCImago #1895 · THE 301–350 · QS =358	1
Wilfrid Laurier University	Canada	SCImago #5987 · THE 1201–1500	1
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	United States	SCImago #3455 · THE 601–800	1
University of Hanover	Germany	—	1
Istanbul University-Cerrahpasa	Turkey	SCImago #6729 · THE 1201–1500	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	3
Turkey	2
Canada	2
United Kingdom	1
India	1
Germany	1
Belgium	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	Tourism destination marketing alliances	3	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	Using neural network analysis to evaluate buyer-seller relationships	1	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 3	Determinants of relationship quality: an artificial neural network analysis	0	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher