

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Christopher Keith Haddock

Senior Scientist and Director, Data Science Core

[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

1 Citing papers mapped	1 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	63 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 1 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	1
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 developed a method for combining effect size estimates in meta-analysis involving repeated measures and independent-groups designs, establishing a foundational statistical approach widely adopted by independent scholars.

The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a statistical method for combining effect size estimates in meta-analysis that accommodates both repeated measures and independent-groups designs. This work is anchored in a 1994 paper published in *Psychological Methods*, which serves as the core reference for this line of inquiry. The titles indicate a focus on resolving methodological complexities inherent in synthesizing data from different experimental designs within a single meta-analytic framework.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in meta-analytic methodology by providing a unified approach for studies that do not fit standard independent-groups assumptions. By integrating repeated measures designs into the meta-analytic process, the researcher offered a novel solution for researchers dealing with complex data structures. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests that this single publication successfully established a definitive method that required no further refinement by the original creator.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, the citation analysis reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work’s broad impact beyond the researcher’s immediate academic circle. This high degree of independent uptake confirms the method’s utility and acceptance as a standard tool in psychological research methodology.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

[Combining effect size estimates in meta-analysis with repeated measures and independent-groups designs](#)

1994 · *Psychological Methods* · 1,423 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,426 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Mathematics papers from 1994 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The Power of Feedback Revisited: A Meta-Analysis of Educational Feedback Research (2020)	University of Augsburg, University of Melbourne	Australia, 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.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Augsburg	Germany	SCImago #2961	1
University of Melbourne	Australia	SCImago #72 · THE 37 · QS 19	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Australia	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.

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	Combining effect size estimates in meta-analysis with repeated measures and independent-groups designs	1	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher