Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Aravind Jembu Rajkumar

University of Maryland

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

52	63	3	3
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.

87.5% independent of 24 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	21
Self-citation	3
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

28 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 framework for assessing and remediating PDF accessibility, subsequently developing and evaluating a tool to assist content creators in improving file accessibility.

The researcher's contribution centers on addressing the accessibility of research papers in PDF format. This line of work is anchored by a 2020 core paper that investigates the tools required for assessment and remediation, followed by a 2022 publication detailing the development and evaluation of a specific tool to assist content creators.

This sequence suggests a progression from identifying necessary assessment capabilities to implementing practical solutions. The core paper appears to define the requirements for accessibility tools, while the follow-up work indicates the researcher moved beyond theoretical needs to create and test a functional instrument for content creators.

The impact of this work is evidenced by 46 citations for the core paper and 21 for the follow-up. Notably, 87.5% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that the broader academic community has adopted these frameworks and tools outside the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 23 · **5 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

PDF accessibility of research papers: What tools are needed for assessment and remediation?

2020 · HICSS, 1-10, 2020 · 46 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Document Information Extraction, Structure Understanding and Manipulation	University of Maryland	United States	—
2	Exploring the role of generative AI in higher education: Semi-structured interviews with students with disabilities	—	—	—
3	Towards more accessible scientific pdfs for people with visual impairments: Step-by-step PDF remediation to improve tag accuracy	University of Zurich	Switzerland	**Influential**
4	Uncovering the new accessibility crisis in scholarly PDFs: publishing model and platform changes contribute to declining scholarly document accessibility in the last …	University of Washington	United States	Background
5	Improving the accessibility of scientific documents: Current state, user needs, and a system solution to enhance scientific PDF accessibility for blind and low vision …	Allen Institute for AI, Allen Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Johns Hopkins University	United States	Background
6	iTagPDF: Towards Finally Automating PDF Accessibility	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	**Influential**
7	PDF accessibility in open repositories: A large-scale automated assessment	—	—	—
8	Gauging awareness of accessibility in Open Educational Resources	—	—	—
9	An Opportunity to Use AI to Support Content Creators in Creating Born-Accessible Documents	—	—	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
10	Automating Digital Accessibility AI and Machine Learning for Inclusive Learning Environments	—	—	—

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).

FOLLOW-UP WORK

Development and evaluation of a tool for assisting content creators in making PDF files more accessible

2022 · ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing (TACCESS) 15 (1), 1-52, 2022 · 21 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Document Information Extraction, Structure Understanding and Manipulation	University of Maryland	United States	—
2	Towards more accessible scientific pdfs for people with visual impairments: Step-by-step PDF remediation to improve tag accuracy	University of Zurich	Switzerland	—
3	Uncovering the new accessibility crisis in scholarly PDFs: publishing model and platform changes contribute to declining scholarly document accessibility in the last …	University of Washington	United States	Background
4	iTagPDF: Towards Finally Automating PDF Accessibility	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	**Influential**
5	An Opportunity to Use AI to Support Content Creators in Creating Born-Accessible Documents	—	—	—
6	Accessible PDFs: applying artificial intelligence for automated remediation of STEM PDFs	University of Zurich	Switzerland	**Influential**
7	Lost in Instructions: Study of Blind Users' Experiences with DIY Manuals and AI-Rewritten Instructions for Assembly, Operation, and Troubleshooting of Tangible …	Old Dominion University	United States	—
8	Combined accessibility validation and monitoring of web sites and PDF documents	—	—	—
9	FormA11y—research and development of a tool for remediating pdf forms for accessibility	Adobe Research, Northwestern University, University of Maryland	United States	**Influential**
10	Blind and visually impaired users' interactions with digital libraries: Help-seeking situations in mobile and desktop environments	—	—	**Methodology**
11	Debugging for inclusivity in online cs courseware: Does it work?	—	—	Background

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
12	The Accessibility Paradox: Can Research Articles Inspecting Accessibility Be Inaccessible?	Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway	—
13	Inaccessible PDF forms Limited Access to the Courts during the Pandemic: A Window into Broader Issues of Inequities and Inaccessibility for People with Disabilities …	Adobe, University of Maryland	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 of Maryland	United States	—	6
University of Zurich	Switzerland	SCImago #313 · QS 100	2
University of Washington	United States	SCImago #45 · THE 25 · QS 81	2
University of Wisconsin-Madison	United States	SCImago #174 · THE =53 · QS =110	1
Johns Hopkins University	United States	SCImago #33 · THE 16 · QS 24	1
Adobe Research	United States	—	1
Adobe	United States	—	1
Carnegie Mellon University	United States	SCImago #266 · THE 24 · QS 52	1
Old Dominion University	United States	SCImago #3782 · THE 801–1000	1
Universidade do Porto	Portugal	SCImago #421 · THE 401–500 · QS =237	1
Allen Institute of Artificial Intelligence	United States	—	1
Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway	SCImago #470 · THE 301–350 · QS 267	1
Allen Institute for AI	United States	—	1
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	10
Switzerland	2
Norway	1
Portugal	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.

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	PDF accessibility of research papers: What tools are needed for assessment and remediation?	23	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5