Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Benjamin Neale

Massachusetts General Hospital; Broad Institute; Harvard Medical School

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

3	3	1	168
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.

100.0% independent of 3 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	3
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 PLINK, a widely adopted software suite for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses, establishing a foundational tool for genetic research.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of PLINK, a comprehensive tool set designed for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses. This work, published in 2007, serves as the cornerstone of this specific line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher expanding directly on this specific software release within the provided data.

This contribution appears to address the need for efficient computational methods in genetic analysis. By providing a dedicated suite for these complex statistical tasks, the work likely simplified the workflow for researchers conducting large-scale genetic studies, offering a standardized approach to linkage and association testing that was previously less accessible or fragmented.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count, indicating widespread adoption and utility within the scientific community. Furthermore, the citation analysis reveals that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the tool has been embraced by the broader field rather than just the researcher's immediate circle, underscoring its independent impact and essential role in genetic research.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses

2007 · 38,990 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 32,174 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2007 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	JCVI: A versatile toolkit for comparative genomics analysis	Agricultural Genomics Institute at Shenzhen Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Fujian Agriculture and Forestry University	Australia, China, United States	—
2	Multi-omics of the gut microbial ecosystem in inflammatory bowel diseases	Baylor College of Medicine, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center	Sweden, United States	—
3	Genome-wide association studies	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, University of Cape Town, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Netherlands, South Africa, Sweden	—

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
Massachusetts General Hospital	United States	SCImago #100	1
KTH Royal Institute of Technology	Sweden	SCImago #497 · THE =98 · QS 78	1
Washington University School of Medicine	United States	—	1
Baylor College of Medicine	United States	SCImago #560	1
Emory University	United States	SCImago #217 · THE 102 · QS 182	1
Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health	United States	—	1
University of Cape Town	South Africa	SCImago #1052 · THE =164 · QS 150	1
Chinese Academy of Sciences	China	SCImago #2	1
University of California Los Angeles	United States	SCImago #70 · THE =18 · QS 46	1
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center	United States	SCImago #705	1
Massachusetts General Hospital; Harvard Medical School	United States	—	1
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory	United States	SCImago #1240	1
Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School	United States	—	1
Wellcome Sanger Institute	United Kingdom	SCImago #204	1
Washington University	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Sweden	2
United States	2
Netherlands	1
Australia	1
United Kingdom	1
South Africa	1
China	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	PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses	3	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher