Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Robin N. Kok

HumanTotalCare, dept. of Research and Business Development

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

7	7	1	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.

100.0% independent of 7 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
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 established the critical role of persuasive system design in web-based health interventions through a seminal systematic review.

The researcher's contribution centers on a 2012 systematic review published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research, which examines adherence to web-based interventions. This work asserts that persuasive system design is a significant factor in user engagement and compliance within digital health contexts.

This line of work appears to address a gap in understanding how design elements influence behavioral outcomes in web-based health tools. By synthesizing existing evidence, the researcher provided a structured framework for evaluating the impact of persuasive technologies, distinguishing this approach from general usability studies.

The work has achieved substantial recognition, with nearly 1700 citations indicating its foundational status in the field. Notably, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting broad adoption and validation of these findings across diverse academic and professional communities.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

Persuasive system design does matter: a systematic review of adherence to web-based interventions

2012 · Journal of Medical Internet Research · 1,697 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,283 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2012 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	An Overview of Chatbot-Based Mobile Mental Health Apps: Insights From App Description and User Reviews (2023)	Marquette University	United States	—
2	The Engagement Problem: a Review of Engagement with Digital Mental Health Interventions and Recommendations for a Path Forward (2023)	Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard University, UT Southwestern Medical Center	United States	—
3	Conceptualising engagement with digital behaviour change interventions: a systematic review using principles from critical interpretive synthesis (2016)	University College London	United Kingdom	Background
4	Effectiveness of online mindfulness-based interventions in improving mental health: A review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (2016)	University of Twente	Netherlands	—
5	Internet-delivered psychological treatments: from innovation to implementation (2019)	Karolinska Institutet, Linköping University, Macquarie University	Australia, Sweden	—
6	Digital Interventions for the Treatment of Depression: A Meta-Analytic Review (2021)	Albert-Ludwigs-University, Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg, Ulm University	Finland, Germany, Italy	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
7	Understanding and Promoting Effective Engagement With Digital Behavior Change Interventions (2016)	Coventry University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Northwestern University	Netherlands, United Kingdom, 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
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	2
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	SCImago #63 · THE =3 · QS 6	1
Macquarie University	Australia	SCImago #1047 · THE =166 · QS =138	1
University of California, San Diego	United States	SCImago #120 · THE 47 · QS 66	1
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg	Germany	—	1
University of Twente	Netherlands	SCImago #1005 · THE =190 · QS =203	1
Harvard University	United States	SCImago #4 · THE =5 · QS 5	1
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	1
University of Helsinki	Finland	SCImago #368 · THE =105 · QS =116	1
University of Southampton	United Kingdom	SCImago #556 · THE 129 · QS 87	1
Coventry University	United Kingdom	SCImago #2218 · THE 601–800 · QS 558	1
Marquette University	United States	SCImago #4340 · QS 1201-1400	1
Albert-Ludwigs-University	Germany	—	1
Brigham and Women's Hospital	United States	SCImago #130	1
Stockholm University	Sweden	SCImago #578 · THE 201–250 · QS =147	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	3
Netherlands	3
United Kingdom	2
Germany	1
Italy	1
Australia	1

Country	Citing papers
Sweden	1
Finland	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	Persuasive system design does matter: a systematic review of adherence to web-based interventions	7	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5