

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

## Kathleen Broussard

Assistant Professor of Sociology, The University of South Carolina

[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>16</b> Citing papers mapped	<b>16</b> Citation edges	<b>3</b> Home papers mapped	<b>13</b> 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.

**75.0% independent** of 16 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	12
Self-citation	4
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 provided seminal qualitative insights into the experiences of Irish women accessing abortion abroad or via medication, establishing a critical evidence base for reproductive health policy.*

CLAIM: The researcher’s contribution centers on a 2018 study published in BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health, which examines the experiences of women in Ireland who accessed abortion by traveling abroad or using medication at home. This work stands as a standalone core contribution without direct follow-up papers by the same author.

ORIGINALITY: The titles indicate this work addresses a specific gap in understanding the lived realities of women navigating restrictive abortion laws in Ireland. By focusing on qualitative experiences rather than just clinical outcomes, the research appears to offer a nuanced perspective on the personal and logistical challenges faced by this population during a period of legal transition.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has garnered 52 citations, suggesting it has become a recognized reference point in the field. Notably, 75% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher’s immediate network and contributed broadly to the academic discourse on reproductive health.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6 · 2 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar

#### CORE PAPER

### [Experiences of women in Ireland who accessed abortion by travelling abroad or by using abortion medication at home: a qualitative study](#)

2018 · BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health · 52 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Self-managed abortion: A systematic scoping review</a> (2020)	Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health, Ibis Reproductive Health, University of California	United States	Influential
2	<a href="#">Demand for self-managed online telemedicine abortion in eight European countries during the COVID-19 pandemic: a regression discontinuity analysis</a> (2021)	The University of Texas at Austin, Women on Web	Netherlands, United States	—
3	<a href="#">Technology in Abortion Care: a Scoping Review on Contexts of Use, Research Methods, Ethical Considerations and Impact</a> (2026)	The Coombe Hospital, University College Cork, University College Dublin	Ireland	—
4	<a href="#">"It was close enough, but it wasn't close enough": A qualitative exploration of the impact of direct-to-patient telemedicine abortion on access to abortion care</a> (2021)	Gynuity Health Projects, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa	United States	—
5	<a href="#">The economics of abortion and its links with stigma: A secondary analysis from a scoping review on the economics of abortion.</a> (2021)	Ipas, Rutgers University	United States	Influential
6	<a href="#">Abortion, Stigma, and Intersectionality</a> (2023)	London School of Economics and Political Science, Queen Mary University of London	United Kingdom	—

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 advanced understanding of online medication abortion access by documenting user motivations and experiences in the United States through a seminal, highly cited study.*

CLAIM: The researcher established a foundational understanding of the motivations and experiences of individuals seeking medication abortion online in the United States, primarily through a core publication in Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address a critical gap in the literature by focusing on the specific user perspectives and decision-making processes associated with online access to abortion services, a topic that was emerging in prominence during the publication period.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has garnered 113 citations, indicating substantial uptake by the academic community. Notably, 75% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that this work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate network and institution.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

#### CORE PAPER

### [Motivations and Experiences of People Seeking Medication Abortion Online in the United States](#)

2018 · Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health · 113 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 75 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Medicine papers from 2018 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Abortion care guideline</a> (2022)	World Health Organization	Switzerland	—

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 3

### Claim – Contribution 3

*The researcher provided seminal empirical evidence on how restrictive abortion laws in Northern Ireland shaped women's decision-making processes and lived experiences.*

CLAIM: The researcher's contribution centers on a 2019 study published in BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health, which examined the impact of Northern Ireland's abortion laws on women's decision-making and experiences. This work stands as a core piece of evidence in this specific area of reproductive health policy research.

ORIGINALITY: By focusing on the specific legal context of Northern Ireland, this line of work appears to address a critical gap in understanding how statutory restrictions directly influence individual reproductive choices. The titles suggest a qualitative or mixed-methods approach to capturing the nuanced experiences of women navigating these legal constraints, offering insights that broader quantitative studies might overlook.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has garnered 40 citations, indicating sustained academic interest. Notably, 75% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the findings have resonated beyond the author’s immediate network and contributed to broader scholarly discourse on reproductive rights and healthcare access.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5 · 1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar

CORE PAPER

**The impact of Northern Ireland's abortion laws on women's abortion decision-making and experiences**

2019 · BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health · 40 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 18 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Law papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Why do they take the risk? A systematic review of the qualitative literature on informal sector abortions in settings where abortion is legal.</a> (2019)	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine	United Kingdom	Influential
2	<a href="#">The impact of criminalisation on abortion-related outcomes: a synthesis of legal and health evidence</a> (2022)	Oregon Health & Science University, University of Birmingham, University of York	United Kingdom, United States	—
3	<a href="#">Effectiveness of self-managed medication abortion between 13 and 24 weeks gestation: A retrospective review of case records from accompaniment groups in Argentina, Chile, and Ecuador</a> (2020)	Con las Amigas y en la Casa, Oregon Health Science University	Chile, United States	—
4	<a href="#">Accessing abortion in a highly restrictive legal regime: characteristics of women and pregnant people in Malta self-managing their abortion through online telemedicine</a> (2023)	University of Malta, University of Oxford, Women on Web International Foundation	Malta, United Kingdom	—
5	<a href="#">Abortion and well-being: A narrative literature review</a> (2024)	London School of Economics and Political Science, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, University of Birmingham	United Kingdom	—

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
World Health Organization	Switzerland	SCImago #172	3
London School of Economics and Political Science	United Kingdom	SCImago #1403 · THE 52 · QS 56	2
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine	United Kingdom	SCImago #802	2

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Birmingham	United Kingdom	SCImago #369 · THE =98 · QS 76	2
University of Texas at Austin	United States	THE 50 · QS 68	2
Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health	—	—	1
Women on Web International Foundation	—	—	1
The Coombe Hospital	Ireland	—	1
Ipas	United States	—	1
Oregon Health Science University	United States	—	1
Con las Amigas y en la Casa	Chile	—	1
University of California, Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	1
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	1
Queen Mary University of London	United Kingdom	SCImago #416 · THE =134 · QS =110	1
University of California	United States	—	1





### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	9
United Kingdom	5
Malta	1
Chile	1
Switzerland	1
Netherlands	1
Ireland	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.

2020		4
2021		3
2022		3
2023		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	Experiences of women in Ireland who accessed abortion by travelling abroad or by using abortion medication at home: a qualitative study	6	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	Motivations and Experiences of People Seeking Medication Abortion Online in the United States	1	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 3	The impact of Northern Ireland's abortion laws on women's abortion decision-making and experiences	5	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher