Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

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

Edward Lichtenstein

Senior Scientist, Oregon 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

13	13	2	76
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 13 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	13
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 a foundational framework for understanding and preventing relapse, as evidenced by a seminal 1986 paper in American Psychologist with over 1,700 citations.

The researcher's primary contribution lies in the development of a comprehensive framework for understanding and preventing relapse, anchored by the 1986 publication 'Understanding and Preventing Relapse' in American Psychologist. This work stands as a singular, high-impact contribution without direct follow-up papers by the same author in the provided dataset.

This line of work appears to address the critical gap in clinical psychology regarding the mechanisms of relapse and strategies for prevention. By publishing in a top-tier venue, the researcher introduced a conceptual model that likely redefined how practitioners and scholars approach the recurrence of psychological conditions, offering a structured approach where none may have previously existed.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count of 1,709, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, the fact that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers demonstrates that this work has been validated and utilized by the broader scientific community, rather than relying on self-citation or institutional bias.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

Understanding and Preventing Relapse

1986 · American Psychologist · 1,709 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 947 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 1986 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? (2000)	Case Western Reserve University	United States	Background
2	A stitch in time: self-regulation and proactive coping. (1997)	University of Maryland	United States	—
3	How Emotion Shapes Behavior: Feedback, Anticipation, and Reflection, Rather Than Direct Causation (2007)	Florida State University, Peking University, University of Minnesota	China, United States	—
4	Stages of Change and Decisional Balance for 12 Problem Behaviors (1994)	University of Rhode Island	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).

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher critically redefined the efficacy-to-effectiveness transition in health promotion, identifying systemic barriers that hinder the translation of research into public health practice.

CLAIM: The researcher's seminal 2003 work in the American Journal of Public Health, titled 'Why Don't We See More Translation of Health Promotion Research to Practice? Rethinking the Efficacy-to-Effectiveness Transition,' establishes a critical framework for understanding the gap between research efficacy and real-world effectiveness. This paper stands as the core contribution of this line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the researcher addressed a persistent disconnect in public health, challenging existing assumptions about how research findings are implemented. By reframing the transition from efficacy to effectiveness, the work appears to have introduced a necessary critical perspective on why promising interventions often fail to scale or sustain impact in practice.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 2,475 citations, this paper has clearly influenced the field significantly. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and built upon by the broader scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle. This high level of independent uptake underscores the paper's foundational role in health promotion research.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 9

CORE PAPER

Why Don't We See More Translation of Health Promotion Research to Practice? Rethinking the Efficacy-to-Effectiveness Transition

2003 · American Journal of Public Health · 2,475 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,794 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	The Sustainability of Evidence-Based Interventions and Practices in Public Health and Health Care (2018)	Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, Stanford University, Washington State University	United States	—
2	Evidence-based intervention sustainability strategies: a systematic review (2019)	Child & Adolescent Services Research Center (CASRC), Community-Based Organizational Partners (CBOP), Michigan State University	United States	—
3	Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance (2015)	Cardiff University, Centre of Excellence in Intervention and Prevention Science, University of Bristol	Australia, United Kingdom	—
4	Effectiveness-implementation hybrid designs: combining elements of clinical effectiveness and implementation research to enhance public health impact (2012)	University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	United States	Background
5	Reflections on 10 years of effectiveness-implementation hybrid studies (2022)	Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System, Kaiser Permanente Southern California, National Cancer Institute	United States	Background
6	The New Psychology of Health: Unlocking the Social Cure (2018)	The University of Queensland	Australia	—
7	Planning Health Promotion Programs: An Intervention Mapping Approach (2016)	Maastricht University, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, UTHealth	Netherlands, United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
8	Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence: 2008 Update: Clinical Practice Guideline (2008)	National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, University of Alabama at Birmingham, University of California San Francisco	United States	—
9	Reprint of: An introduction to effectiveness-implementation hybrid designs (2020)	Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System, Department of Veterans Affairs	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
Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System	United States	SCImago #2001	2
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	United States	SCImago #2807	2
Michigan State University	United States	SCImago #436 · THE =105 · QS 161	1
University of California San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1
The University of Queensland	Australia	SCImago #126 · THE =80 · QS =42	1
University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health	United States	—	1
University of Alabama at Birmingham	United States	QS 1001-1200	1
University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston	United States	SCImago #1172	1
University of Texas	United States	—	1
Case Western Reserve University	United States	SCImago #627 · THE =145 · QS =294	1
University of Minnesota	United States	SCImago #165 · THE 88 · QS 210	1
University of Wisconsin	United States	—	1
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	United States	SCImago #345	1
Maastricht University	Netherlands	SCImago #783 · THE =131 · QS 239	1
Washington State University	United States	THE 401–500 · QS =423	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	11

Country	Citing papers
Australia	2
China	1
Netherlands	1
United Kingdom	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	Understanding and Preventing Relapse	4	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	Why Don't We See More Translation of Health Promotion Research to Practice? Rethinking the Efficacy-to-Effectiveness Transition	9	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher