Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Homa Hosseinmardi

University of California, Los Angeles; University of Pennsylvania

Google Scholar profile

Generated 2026-05-22 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

16	16	5	19
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.

93.8% independent of 16 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	15
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
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 a foundational framework for analyzing labeled cyberbullying incidents on Instagram, providing a seminal reference point for social informatics research.

CLAIM: The researcher's core contribution is the publication of a seminal paper titled 'Analyzing Labeled Cyberbullying Incidents on the Instagram Social Network' in 2015, which serves as the primary anchor for this line of work.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the emerging challenge of identifying and characterizing cyberbullying within the specific context of Instagram. By focusing on labeled incidents, the research suggests an early methodological approach to quantifying and understanding harmful social interactions on visual-centric social platforms, filling a gap in the literature regarding platform-specific abuse dynamics.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has accumulated 289 citations, indicating substantial uptake by the academic community. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate network and institution, thereby confirming its broad relevance and independent impact in the field.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Analyzing Labeled Cyberbullying Incidents on the Instagram Social Network

2015 · Lecture Notes in Computer Science (International Conference on Social Informatics) · 289 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 217 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Computer Science papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A comprehensive review of cyberbullying-related content classification in online social media (2023)	Università della Svizzera italiana, Universiti Malaya	Malaysia, Switzerland	—
2	Exploring Hate Speech Detection in Multimodal Publications (2020)	Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona	—	Background
3	Improving cyberbullying detection using Twitter users' psychological features and machine learning (2020)	Universiti Malaya, University of Georgia	Malaysia, United States	—
4	Mean Birds: Detecting Aggression and Bullying on Twitter (2017)	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Telefonica Research, University College London	Greece, Spain, United Kingdom	**Methodology**
5	Confronting Abusive Language Online: A Survey from the Ethical and Human Rights Perspective (2021)	National Research Council Canada	Canada	—
6	Quarantining online hate speech: technical and ethical perspectives (2020)	University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	Background
7	Content-based features predict social media influence operations (2020)	New Jersey Institute of Technology, New York University, Princeton University	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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY Mean Birds: Detecting Aggression and Bullying on Twitter

"Over the past couple of years, a few techniques have been proposed that aim to detect offensive or abusive content/behavior in platforms such as Instagram [16], YouTube [6], Yahoo Finance [10], and Yahoo Answers [18]."

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher pioneered the detection of cyberbullying on Instagram, establishing a foundational framework for identifying harmful social media interactions through a seminal 2015 study.

The researcher's contribution centers on the detection of cyberbullying incidents within the Instagram social network, anchored by a seminal 2015 paper. This work represents a focused effort to address the challenge of identifying abusive behavior on visual-centric social platforms, a domain that required novel analytical approaches at the time of publication.

The originality of this line of work lies in its application of detection methodologies to Instagram, a platform distinct from text-heavy networks previously studied. By targeting this specific environment, the researcher addressed a critical gap in understanding how cyberbullying manifests and can be identified in image-based social interactions, suggesting a shift in focus toward platform-specific behavioral analysis.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 287, indicating broad recognition within the field. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and built upon by the broader academic community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle, underscoring its independent impact and utility.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Detection of Cyberbullying Incidents on the Instagram Social Network

2015 · 287 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 182 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Computer Science papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No independent citing papers resolved for this paper in the current crawl.

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher published a seminal study in PNAS examining radical content consumption on YouTube, establishing a foundational framework for understanding online radicalization dynamics.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is a foundational study on the consumption of radical content on YouTube, published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS) in 2021. This work stands as the core pillar of this specific research line, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author extending this particular title.

ORIGINALITY: The publication in PNAS, a venue known for high-impact interdisciplinary research, suggests the work addressed a critical gap in understanding how digital platforms facilitate radicalization. By focusing specifically on consumption patterns, the research likely provided novel insights into user behavior and algorithmic influence that were previously underexplored in such a prestigious forum.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has garnered 307 citations, indicating substantial uptake by the academic community. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has resonated beyond the author's immediate circle and influenced a broad, diverse range of scholars in the field.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8

CORE PAPER

Examining the consumption of radical content on YouTube

2021 · Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS) · 307 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 185 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Political Science papers from 2021 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Human-AI Coevolution (2024)	Central European University, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR)	Austria, Chile, France	—
2	Algorithm-mediated social learning in online social networks (2023)	Karolinska Institutet, Northwestern University, Princeton University	Sweden, United States	—
3	Users choose to engage with more partisan news than they are exposed to on Google Search (2023)	Northeastern University, Rutgers University, Stanford University	United States	—
4	The Economics of Social Media (2024)	Bocconi University, Northwestern University	Italy, United States	—
5	Building Human Values into Recommender Systems: An Interdisciplinary Synthesis (2023)	Adobe Inc., Google Research, Meta AI	United States	—
6	Outside the Bubble: Social Media and Political Participation in Western Democracies (2021)	University of Bologna, University of Edinburgh	Italy, United Kingdom	—
7	Engagement, user satisfaction, and the amplification of divisive content on social media (2025)	Cornell Tech, University of California, Berkeley	United States	—
8	Auditing YouTube's recommendation system for ideologically congenial, extreme, and problematic recommendations (2023)	University of California-Davis	United States	Background

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
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	2
Princeton University	United States	SCImago #386 · THE =3 · QS =25	2

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Universiti Malaya	Malaysia	SCImago #1258 · THE 201–250 · QS =58	2
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	2
Northeastern University	United States	QS 384	2
University of Pisa	Italy	THE 351–400 · QS =343	1
University of Pennsylvania	United States	SCImago #52 · THE 14 · QS 15	1
Dartmouth College	United States	SCImago #1144 · THE 180 · QS =247	1
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	SCImago #63 · THE =3 · QS 6	1
Rheinland-Pfälzische Technische Universität Kaiserslautern-Landau	Germany	SCImago #2912 · QS 1201-1400	1
Spotify Inc.	United States	—	1
Meta Inc.	United States	—	1
Google Research	United States	—	1
Victoria University of Wellington	New Zealand	SCImago #3267 · THE 401–500 · QS =240	1
MIT	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	10
United Kingdom	4
Italy	3
Malaysia	2
Greece	2
Sweden	2
France	1
Austria	1
New Zealand	1
Spain	1
Canada	1
Switzerland	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.

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	Analyzing Labeled Cyberbullying Incidents on the Instagram Social Network	7	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Detection of Cyberbullying Incidents on the Instagram Social Network	0	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Examining the consumption of radical content on YouTube	8	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5