# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

## Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara

Tethys 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 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

| 6 | 6 | 2 | 66 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 6 classified citing papers

| Citation type | Count |
|---|---|
| Independent | 6 |
| 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 comprehensive global conservation action plan for cetaceans, establishing a foundational framework for international marine mammal protection efforts.*

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a seminal global conservation action plan for cetaceans, published in 2003 by the IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. This work serves as the core reference for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher identified in the provided data.

This publication appears to address the critical need for a coordinated, worldwide strategy for the conservation of dolphins, whales, and porpoises. By synthesizing conservation priorities into a single, authoritative document, the work likely filled a significant gap in standardized global policy guidance for marine mammal protection during that period.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 660, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the scientific community. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad impact beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network.

**INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1**

**CORE PAPER**

**Dolphins, whales and porpoises : 2002-2010 conservation action plan for the world's cetaceans**

2003 · IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group, IUCN · 660 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 444 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Environmental Science papers from 2003 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper | Citing institution(s) | Country | S2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The Biodiversity of the Mediterranean Sea: Estimates, Patterns, and Threats (2010) | Albert-Ludwigs-University, Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki, Centre d'Estudis Avançats de Blanes (CSIC) | Canada, Croatia, France | — |

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 2

### Claim — Contribution 2

*The researcher advanced marine spatial planning frameworks to address critical shortcomings in marine protected areas, establishing a highly cited foundation for large-scale ocean governance.*

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2011 paper 'Mind the gap: Addressing the shortcomings of marine protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning,' published in Marine Policy. This work stands as the core of this specific line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author identified in the provided data.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in ocean governance by proposing large-scale marine spatial planning as a solution to the limitations of traditional marine protected areas. The title suggests a shift from isolated conservation zones to integrated, systemic planning, offering a novel conceptual framework for addressing ecological and management shortcomings.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 953, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad impact beyond the researcher's immediate academic circle and confirming its status as a seminal reference in marine policy.

**INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5**

**CORE PAPER**

### Mind the gap: Addressing the shortcomings of marine protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning

2011 · Marine Policy · 953 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 676 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Environmental Science papers from 2011 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper | Citing institution(s) | Country | S2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Marine defaunation: animal loss in the global ocean (2015) | Rutgers University, Stanford University, Hopkins Marine Station, University of California, Santa Barbara | United States | Background |
| 2 | Why local people do not support conservation: Community perceptions of marine protected area livelihood impacts, governance and management in Thailand (2014) | University of British Columbia, University of Victoria | Canada | — |
| 3 | Shades of blue: what do competing interpretations of the Blue Economy mean for oceans governance? (2018) | University of Wollongong | Australia | — |
| 4 | Local-scale projections of coral reef futures and implications of the Paris Agreement (2016) | Bangor University, Griffith University, International Union for Conservation of Nature | Australia, France, United Kingdom | — |
| 5 | Reinventing residual reserves in the sea: are we favouring ease of establishment over need for protection? (2015) | Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Stanford University | Australia, 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| University of Wollongong | Australia | SCImago #1289 · THE 201–250 · QS =184 | 1 |
| Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania | Australia | — | 1 |
| Stanford University, Hopkins Marine Station | United States | — | 1 |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature | Switzerland | — | 1 |
| Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | United States | — | 1 |
| University of Guam | United States | — | 1 |
| PSL Research University | France | — | 1 |
| Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University | Australia | — | 1 |
| Dalhousie University | Canada | SCImago #1299 · THE 351–400 · QS 283 | 1 |
| The University of British Columbia | Canada | SCImago #144 · THE 45 · QS 40 | 1 |
| University of Technology Sydney | Australia | SCImago #475 · THE =145 · QS 96 | 1 |
| University of British Columbia | Canada | SCImago #144 · THE 45 · QS 40 | 1 |
| James Cook University | Australia | SCImago #2479 · THE 351–400 · QS =440 | 1 |
| University of California, Santa Cruz | United States | SCImago #1349 · THE =181 · QS =458 | 1 |
| Bangor University | United Kingdom | SCImago #3623 · THE 501–600 · QS =566 | 1 |

## Geographic distribution of citing authors

| Country | Citing papers |
|---|---|
| Australia | 3 |
| United States | 3 |
| France | 2 |
| Canada | 2 |
| Greece | 1 |
| Croatia | 1 |
| Italy | 1 |
| Spain | 1 |
| United Kingdom | 1 |
| Israel | 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.

## 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 | Dolphins, whales and porpoises : 2002-2010 conservation action plan for the world's cetaceans | 1 | 8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher |
| Contribution 2 | Mind the gap: Addressing the shortcomings of marine protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning | 5 | 8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher |