

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Marie-Paule Austin

Professor, University of New South Wales

[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

6 Citing papers mapped	6 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	74 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 6 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	6
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 advanced the understanding of functional neuropathology by linking cognitive deficits in depression to underlying neural mechanisms in a seminal 2001 study.

CLAIM: The researcher’s contribution centers on the 2001 paper ‘Cognitive deficits in depression: possible implications for functional neuropathology’; published in The British Journal of Psychiatry. This work stands as the core contribution in this line of research, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author identified in the provided data.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the researcher addressed a critical gap by proposing that cognitive impairments observed in depression are not merely symptomatic but may reflect specific functional neuropathological processes. By framing cognitive deficits as potential indicators of underlying neural dysfunction, the work appears to have shifted the analytical focus from purely clinical descriptions to mechanistic explanations.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has accumulated 1818 citations, indicating substantial uptake within the scientific community. Notably, analysis of a sample of citing papers reveals that 100% of them originate from independent researchers, suggesting the work has influenced a broad and diverse field beyond the author’s immediate institutional or collaborative network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

CORE PAPER

[Cognitive deficits in depression: possible implications for functional neuropathology](#)

2001 · The British Journal of Psychiatry · 1,818 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,177 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2001 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Neurobiology of emotion perception II: Implications for major psychiatric disorders (2003)	Institute of Psychiatry	United Kingdom	Background
2	Understanding the Complex of Suicide in Depression: from Research to Clinics (2020)	Federico II University, Hospital "G. Mazzini", Hospital "SS. Annunziata" ASL 4	Italy, United Kingdom	—
3	The effect of pain on cognitive function: A review of clinical and preclinical research (2011)	University of Galway	Ireland	Background
4	Do job insecurity, anxiety and depression caused by the COVID-19 pandemic influence hotel employees' self-rated task performance? The moderating role of employee resilience (2021)	Institute of Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development (Tides), University of Greenwich, University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria	Spain, United Kingdom	—
5	Executive functions and their disorders: Imaging in clinical neuroscience (2003)	University of Manchester	United Kingdom	—
6	A meta-analysis of cognitive deficits in first-episode Major Depressive Disorder (2012)	Macquarie University, UCLA, University of the Sunshine Coast	Australia, 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).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Macquarie University	Australia	SCImago #1047 · THE =166 · QS =138	1
Federico II University	Italy	—	1
University of the Sunshine Coast	Australia	SCImago #4847 · THE 501–600	1
University of Galway	Ireland	SCImago #2168 · THE 351–400 · QS 284	1
UCLA	United States	—	1
Sapienza University	Italy	—	1
University of Manchester	United Kingdom	SCImago #196 · THE 56 · QS 35	1
Polytechnic University of Marche	Italy	—	1
Institute of Psychiatry	United Kingdom	—	1
University of Hertfordshire	United Kingdom	SCImago #2939 · THE 601–800 · QS 901-950	1
Neomesia Mental Health	Italy	—	1
University of Genoa, IRCCS Ospedale Policlinico San Martino	Italy	—	1
University of "G. D'Annunzio"	Italy	—	1
Villa S. Giuseppe Hospital	Italy	—	1
Hospital "SS. Annunziata" ASL 4	Italy	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United Kingdom	4
Australia	1
Ireland	1
Italy	1
Spain	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.

2003  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	Cognitive deficits in depression: possible implications for functional neuropathology	6	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher