

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

## Abigail R.A. Aiken

University of Texas at Austin

[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

|                                  |                            |                                |                           |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>2</b><br>Citing papers mapped | <b>2</b><br>Citation edges | <b>1</b><br>Home papers mapped | <b>36</b><br>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 2 classified citing papers

| Citation type    | Count |
|------------------|-------|
| Independent      | 2     |
| 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 evidence for the safety and acceptability of no-test telemedicine abortion, providing a foundational national cohort study that supports remote reproductive care models.*

The researcher's contribution centers on a seminal 2021 study published in BJOG, which evaluated the effectiveness, safety, and acceptability of no-test medical abortion provided via telemedicine. This work serves as the core evidence base for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in the provided data.

This research appears to address the critical need for validating remote reproductive healthcare protocols. By focusing on a national cohort, the study likely aimed to determine whether eliminating in-person testing compromises patient safety or satisfaction, thereby challenging traditional clinical requirements for abortion services.

The work has garnered significant attention, accumulating 320 citations. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the findings have been widely adopted and referenced by the broader scientific community outside the researcher's immediate network.

### INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

#### CORE PAPER

#### [Effectiveness, safety and acceptability of no-test medical abortion \(termination of pregnancy\) provided via telemedicine: a national cohort study](#)

2021 · BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology · 320 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 214 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2021 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper   | Citing institution(s)  | Country           | S2 |
|-----|--|--|-------------------|----|
| 1   | <a href="#">Challenging Cognitive Load Theory: The Role of Educational Neuroscience and Artificial Intelligence in Redefining Learning Efficacy</a> (2025) | The University of Notre-Dame Australia, University of Patras | Australia, Greece | —  |
| 2   | <a href="#">Safety and Efficacy of Telehealth Medication Abortions in the US During the COVID-19 Pandemic</a> (2021)                                       | University of California, San Francisco                      | 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 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 California, San Francisco | United States | SCImago #98                                 | 1             |
| University of Patras                    | Greece        | SCImago #2244 · THE 801-1000 · QS 721-730   | 1             |
| The University of Notre-Dame Australia  | Australia     | SCImago #7169 · THE 801-1000 · QS 1201-1400 | 1             |

## Geographic distribution of citing authors

| Country       | Citing papers |
|---------------|---------------|
| Australia     | 1             |
| Greece        | 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 | Effectiveness, safety and acceptability of no-test medical abortion (termination of pregnancy) | 2            | 8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher |

| <b>Contribution</b> | <b>Core paper</b>                                  | <b>Indep. cites</b> | <b>Supports</b> |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|
|                     | provided via telemedicine: a national cohort study |                     |                 |