Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Jeremy Grimshaw

Ottawa Hospital Research Institute

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

31	50	5	164
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.

93.1% independent of 29 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	27
Self-citation	0
Co-author	2
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 established the PRISMA statement, a seminal reporting guideline that standardized the transparency and completeness of systematic reviews and meta-analyses across scientific disciplines.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of the PRISMA statement, introduced in a 2009 paper titled 'Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement.' This work serves as the foundational core of this line of research, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher listed in the provided data, indicating the original publication stands as the definitive artifact of this contribution.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in scientific communication by providing a structured framework for reporting systematic reviews. The title suggests the creation of a standardized checklist or guideline intended to improve the clarity and reproducibility of meta-analytic methods, moving the field away from inconsistent reporting practices toward a unified standard.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating over 158,000 citations. Furthermore, citation analysis reveals that 93.1% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the PRISMA statement has been widely adopted and relied upon by the broader global scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 10 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement

2009 · PLoS medicine 6 (7), e1000097, 2009 · 158,229 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 119,964 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour	Halmstad University, Harvard Medical School, The University of Queensland	Australia, Sweden, United Kingdom	Methodology
2	Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis (2022)	Antimicrobial Resistance Collaborators, Global Burden of Disease collaborator network, Global Burden of Disease Project	Thailand, United Kingdom, United States	—
3	Virtual reality in education: a review of learning theories, approaches and methodologies for the last decade	University of West Attica	Greece	—
4	ChatGPT Utility in Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice: Systematic Review on the Promising Perspectives and Valid Concerns	—	—	—
5	Systematic review and meta-analysis of AI-based conversational agents for promoting mental health and well-being (2023)	Carnegie Mellon University, National University of Singapore, Northwestern University	Singapore, United States	—
6	Model aggregation techniques in federated learning: A comprehensive survey (2024)	University of Calabria, University of Naples Federico II	Italy	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
7	Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests (2022)	Emory University, University of California San Diego	United States	—
8	A systematic review of industrial wastewater management: Evaluating challenges and enablers	Ambala College of Engineering and Applied Research, Federation University, MM Engineering College, Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University	Australia, India	Methodology
9	Emotion recognition and Artificial Intelligence: A Systematic Review (2014-2023) and Research Recommendations (2024)	University of Southern Denmark, University of Southern Queensland	Australia, Denmark	—
10	Smarter eco-cities and their leading-edge artificial intelligence of things solutions for environmental sustainability: A comprehensive systematic review (2024)	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway, Switzerland	—

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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

> **METHODOLOGY** A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour
>
> *"...dated (yet arguably seminal) approaches by Kitchenham et al. (2004, 2007, 2009)—prior to the first and subsequently updated PRISMA guidelines (Moher et al., 2009; Page et al., 2021)—underscore an urgent necessity for contemporary, stringent, and universally adopted review guidelines within..."*

> **METHODOLOGY** A systematic review of industrial wastewater management: Evaluating challenges and enablers
>
> *"The PRISMA approach provides a structured and transparent process for identifying, screening, and selecting relevant studies, as well as assessing the quality of the evidence and synthesizing the findings (Moher et al., 2009)."*

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher developed the Chinese edition of the PRISMA statement, establishing a standardized reporting framework for systematic reviews and meta-analyses in integrative medicine.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of the Chinese edition of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement, published in 2009 in the Journal of Chinese Integrative Medicine. This work serves as the foundational text for this line of research, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher identified in the provided data.

This contribution appears to address the need for standardized reporting guidelines within the specific context of Chinese integrative medicine. By adapting the established PRISMA framework, the researcher likely facilitated clearer communication and methodological rigor in systematic reviews within this specialized field, bridging international standards with local research practices.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 143,636, indicating widespread adoption and influence. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 93.1% of citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the contribution has been broadly recognized and utilized by the global scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 10

CORE PAPER

Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement (Chinese edition)

2009 · Journal of Chinese Integrative Medicine (XXXXXXX) · 143,636 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 285 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Medicine papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour	Halmstad University, Harvard Medical School, The University of Queensland	Australia, Sweden, United Kingdom	—
2	Virtual reality in education: a review of learning theories, approaches and methodologies for the last decade	University of West Attica	Greece	—
3	ChatGPT Utility in Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice: Systematic Review on the Promising Perspectives and Valid Concerns (2023)	—	—	—
4	When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	—
5	How to combine and clean bibliometric data and use bibliometric tools synergistically: Guidelines using metaverse research	Georgia State University, Indian Institute of Management Nagpur, Sunway University	India, Malaysia, United States	—
6	Model aggregation techniques in federated learning: A comprehensive survey (2024)	University of Calabria, University of Naples Federico II	Italy	—
7	Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests (2022)	Emory University, University of California San Diego	United States	—
8	A systematic review of industrial wastewater management: Evaluating challenges and enablers	Ambala College of Engineering and Applied Research, Federation University, MM Engineering College, Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University	Australia, India	—
9	Emotion recognition and Artificial Intelligence: A Systematic Review (2014-2023) and Research Recommendations	University of Southern Denmark, University of Southern Queensland	Australia, Denmark	—
10	Smarter eco-cities and their leading-edge artificial intelligence of things solutions for environmental sustainability: A comprehensive systematic review (2024)	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway, Switzerland	—

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).

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established the PRISMA statement, a seminal reporting guideline for systematic reviews and meta-analyses that has become a foundational standard in evidence-based medicine.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of the PRISMA statement, a comprehensive set of reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. This work, published across major journals including BMJ and PLoS Medicine, serves as the cornerstone of this research line, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher required to extend its core framework.

This line of work appears to address the critical need for standardized, transparent reporting in systematic reviews. By defining specific items for inclusion in such studies, the researcher provided a structured approach to enhance the clarity and completeness of published evidence syntheses, filling a significant gap in methodological rigor.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating nearly 200,000 citations. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 93.1% of citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that the PRISMA statement has been widely adopted and utilized by the broader scientific community as an essential tool for conducting and reporting high-quality systematic reviews.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 10 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement

BMJ, PLoS Medicine, Annals of Internal Medicine, Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, and Open Medicine · 197,148 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 119,964 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour	Halmstad University, Harvard Medical School, The University of Queensland	Australia, Sweden, United Kingdom	Methodology
2	Virtual reality in education: a review of learning theories, approaches and methodologies for the last decade	University of West Attica	Greece	—
3	ChatGPT Utility in Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice: Systematic Review on the Promising Perspectives and Valid Concerns	—	—	—
4	Bibliometric Analysis: The Main Steps	—	—	—
5	When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	—
6	How to combine and clean bibliometric data and use bibliometric tools synergistically: Guidelines using metaverse research	Georgia State University, Indian Institute of Management Nagpur, Sunway University	India, Malaysia, United States	—
7	Model aggregation techniques in federated learning: A comprehensive survey (2024)	University of Calabria, University of Naples Federico II	Italy	—
8	A systematic review of industrial wastewater management: Evaluating challenges and enablers	Ambala College of Engineering and Applied Research, Federation University, MM	Australia, India	Methodology

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
		Engineering College, Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University		
9	What factors contribute to the acceptance of artificial intelligence? A systematic review	Queensland University of Technology	Australia	—
10	Smarter eco-cities and their leading-edge artificial intelligence of things solutions for environmental sustainability: A comprehensive systematic review (2024)	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway, Switzerland	—

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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour

"...dated (yet arguably seminal) approaches by Kitchenham et al. (2004, 2007, 2009)—prior to the first and subsequently updated PRISMA guidelines (Moher et al., 2009; Page et al., 2021)—underscore an urgent necessity for contemporary, stringent, and universally adopted review guidelines within..."

METHODOLOGY A systematic review of industrial wastewater management: Evaluating challenges and enablers

"The PRISMA approach provides a structured and transparent process for identifying, screening, and selecting relevant studies, as well as assessing the quality of the evidence and synthesizing the findings (Moher et al., 2009)."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington	United States	—	3
Tehran University of Medical Sciences	Iran	SCImago #701 · THE 501–600	3
University of Washington	United States	SCImago #45 · THE 25 · QS 81	3
Harvard Medical School	United States	SCImago #12	3
University of Glasgow	United Kingdom	SCImago #351 · THE 84 · QS 79	2
University of Birmingham	United Kingdom	SCImago #369 · THE =98 · QS 76	2
Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences	Iran	THE 601–800	2
Jimma University	Ethiopia	SCImago #5519	2
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	2
Bond University	Australia	SCImago #5650 · THE 401–500 · QS =591	2
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	2
Mayo Clinic	United States	SCImago #88	2
University of California, Los Angeles	United States	SCImago #70 · THE =18 · QS 46	2
Johns Hopkins University	United States	SCImago #33 · THE 16 · QS 24	2

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
The Hospital for Sick Children	Canada	SCImago #1449	2

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	12
Australia	9
United Kingdom	6
India	5
Iran	3
Italy	3
Canada	3
France	3
Switzerland	2
Poland	2
Denmark	2
Ethiopia	2

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	Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement	10	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement (Chinese edition)	10	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement	10	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5