# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

## Matthias Egger

Professor of Epidemiology & Public Health, University of Bern

Google Scholar profile

**Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap.** This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to Criterion 5 (original contributions of major significance). 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 | 2 | 203 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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.

**87.5% independent** of 8 classified citing papers

| Citation type | Count |
|---|---|
| Independent | 7 |
| Self-citation | 1 |
| Co-author | 0 |
| Same-institution | 0 |

2 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 a simple graphical test to detect bias in meta-analysis, a seminal contribution published in the BMJ that has garnered nearly 60,000 citations.*

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a simple, graphical test designed to detect bias in meta-analysis. This work was published in the British Medical Journal in 1997 and stands as a foundational piece in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in this specific line of work.

This line of work appears to address the critical need for accessible methods to assess the validity of meta-analytic results. By introducing a graphical approach, the researcher provided a tool that likely simplified the detection of publication bias or other systematic errors, offering a novel alternative to more complex statistical tests available at the time.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating approximately 59,269 citations. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers indicates that 87.5% of citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the method has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle.

**INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5**

**CORE PAPER**

### Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test

1997 · BMJ (British Medical Journal) · 59,269 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 50,729 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 1997 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper | Citing institution(s) | Country | S2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Effectiveness of physical activity interventions for improving depression, anxiety and distress: an overview of systematic reviews (2023) | University of South Australia | Australia | — |
| 2 | The global epidemiology of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) and nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH): a systematic review (2023) | Inova Fairfax Medical Campus, Inova Health System | United States | — |
| 3 | Ultra-processed food exposure and adverse health outcomes: umbrella review of epidemiological meta-analyses (2024) | Deakin University, Dublin City University, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health | Australia, France, Ireland | — |
| 4 | When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis | Massachusetts Institute of Technology | United States | — |
| 5 | Global prevalence of Helicobacter pylori infection and incidence of gastric cancer between 1980 and 2022 (2024) | China Medical University, E-DA Hospital and I-Shou University, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU) | Australia, France, Germany | — |

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.

## Contribution 2

**Claim — Contribution 2**

*The researcher developed the STROBE statement, a seminal set of guidelines for reporting observational studies that has become a foundational standard in epidemiological research.*

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of the STROBE statement, a comprehensive set of guidelines for reporting observational studies. This work, published in 2007 across multiple high-impact journals including PLOS Medicine and The Lancet, serves as the core foundation of this line of inquiry.

This work appears to address a critical gap in the transparency and quality of epidemiological reporting. By establishing standardized guidelines, the researcher provided a framework to improve the clarity and completeness of observational study reports, thereby enhancing the reliability of scientific findings in this field.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with over 74,000 citations. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers indicates that 87.5% of citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the STROBE statement has been widely adopted and utilized by the broader scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

**INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2**

**CORE PAPER**

### The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies

2007 · PLOS Medicine; Annals of Internal Medicine; BMJ; Bulletin of the World Health Organization; Epidemiology; The Lancet; Preventive Medicine; Journal of Clinical Epidemiology · 74,720 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 10,918 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2007 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper | Citing institution(s) | Country | S2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The global prevalence of osteoporosis in the world: a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis (2021) | Islamic Azad University, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences | Iran, Malaysia | — |
| 2 | Updating guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA 2020 statement (2021) | American University of Beirut, Amsterdam University Medical Centres, Amsterdam University Medical Centres, University of Amsterdam | Australia, Canada, Denmark | — |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| University of Bristol | United Kingdom | SCImago #478 · THE =80 · QS 51 | 2 |
| Monash University | Australia | THE =58 · QS =36 | 2 |

| Institution | Country | World ranking | Citing papers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health | United States | — | 2 |
| University of New South Wales | Australia | SCImago #107 · QS 20 | 1 |
| Amsterdam University Medical Centres | Netherlands | — | 1 |
| Bond University | Australia | SCImago #5650 · THE 401–500 · QS =591 | 1 |
| Oregon Health & Science University | United States | SCImago #689 · THE 351–400 | 1 |
| Evidence Partners | Canada | — | 1 |
| University of York | United Kingdom | SCImago #890 · THE =154 · QS 169 | 1 |
| Sorbonne Paris Nord University | France | — | 1 |
| Ottawa Hospital Research Institute | Canada | SCImago #2914 | 1 |
| University of Ottawa | Canada | SCImago #610 · THE =187 · QS =219 | 1 |
| Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences | Iran | SCImago #5948 · THE 351–400 | 1 |
| Erasmus MC | Netherlands | — | 1 |
| NIHR Bristol Biomedical Research Centre | United Kingdom | SCImago #1654 | 1 |

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

| Country | Citing papers |
|---|---|
| United States | 5 |
| Australia | 4 |
| France | 4 |
| Denmark | 2 |
| Ireland | 2 |
| Netherlands | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 2 |
| Canada | 2 |
| Malaysia | 1 |
| Taiwan | 1 |
| Norway | 1 |
| Germany | 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 | Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test | 5 | 8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5 |
| Contribution 2 | The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies | 2 | 8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5 |