Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Giuseppe Argenziano

Full Professor of Dermatology, University of Campania, Naples, Italy

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	1	106
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.

50.0% independent of 6 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	3
Self-citation	0
Co-author	3
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 consensus framework for dermoscopic evaluation of pigmented skin lesions, significantly standardizing diagnostic criteria in dermatology.

The researcher's primary contribution rests on the 2003 publication in the Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, which documents the results of an Internet-based consensus meeting regarding the dermoscopy of pigmented skin lesions. This work stands as a singular, seminal effort without subsequent follow-up papers by the same author in this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address the need for standardized diagnostic protocols in dermatology. By facilitating a consensus meeting via the Internet, the researcher likely aimed to harmonize diverse clinical perspectives and establish unified criteria for interpreting dermoscopic images, thereby reducing diagnostic variability.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,738, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, the fact that 50% of classified citations originate from independent researchers suggests that the work has been validated and utilized by the broader scientific community beyond the author's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

Dermoscopy of pigmented skin lesions: results of a consensus meeting via the Internet

2003 · Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology · 1,738 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,192 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2003 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A review of deep learning-based multiple-lesion recognition from medical images: classification, detection and segmentation (2023)	Northeastern University, Stevens Institute of Technology	China, United States	—
2	Advances in melanoma: epidemiology, diagnosis, and prognosis (2023)	Temple University Hospital, Thomas Jefferson University	United States	—
3	Skin Lesion Analysis toward Melanoma Detection: A Challenge at the International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI) 2016, hosted by the International Skin Imaging Collaboration (ISIC) (2016)	Emory University, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, Kitware	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).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center	United States	SCImago #210	3
Kitware	United States	—	3

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Hospital Clínic Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, IDIBAPS	Spain	—	2
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya	Spain	SCImago #624 · THE 601–800	2
Mayo Clinic	United States	SCImago #88	1
Weill Cornell Medical College	United States	—	1
University of Athens	Greece	SCImago #617	1
Missouri University of Science and Technology	United States	SCImago #3048 · THE 501–600 · QS =628	1
Rabin Medical Center	Israel	SCImago #2059	1
Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center	United States	SCImago #210	1
IBM T. J. Watson Research Center	United States	—	1
IBM	United States	—	1
Stevens Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #1775 · THE 501–600 · QS =673	1
Medical University of Vienna	Austria	SCImago #668 · THE =181	1
Temple University Hospital	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	6
Spain	3
China	1
Australia	1
Israel	1
Greece	1
Austria	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).

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	Dermoscopy of pigmented skin lesions: results of a consensus meeting via the Internet	3	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher