Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Ivan Molton

University of Washington

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

12	12	2	49
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.

91.7% independent of 12 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	11
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
Same-institution	1

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 reference for prosthesis utilization patterns in limb amputees, providing critical epidemiological data that has significantly influenced rehabilitation research and clinical practice.

The researcher's contribution centers on the seminal 2008 publication in the Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development, titled 'Prosthesis use in persons with lower- and upper-limb amputation.' This work serves as the core anchor for this line of inquiry, offering a comprehensive examination of prosthetic adoption and usage among individuals with limb loss. The titles indicate a focus on characterizing the real-world application of prosthetic devices across different amputation levels, establishing a baseline understanding of patient engagement with rehabilitation technology.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in understanding the extent and nature of prosthesis use, moving beyond mere device availability to actual patient utilization. By systematically documenting usage patterns in both lower- and upper-limb amputees, the research provides essential context for evaluating rehabilitation outcomes and identifying barriers to effective prosthetic integration. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher suggests this single study stands as a definitive, standalone contribution that required no immediate iterative expansion to achieve its impact.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation record, with 444 citations indicating widespread recognition and utility within the field. Notably, 91.7% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the findings have been adopted and built upon by the broader scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle. This high degree of independent uptake underscores the work's role as a standard reference point for subsequent studies in rehabilitation science and prosthetics.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Prosthesis use in persons with lower- and upper-limb amputation

2008 · Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development · 444 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 271 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Medicine papers from 2008 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Embodiment for Robotic Lower-Limb Exoskeletons: A Narrative Review (2023)	University of Florida	—	Influential
2	Revolutionizing Prosthetic Design with Auxetic Metamaterials and Structures: A Review of Mechanical Properties and Limitations (2023)	Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City (IUH), Universitas Sebelas Maret	Indonesia, Vietnam	—
3	Implementation of 3D Printing Technology in the Field of Prosthetics: Past, Present, and Future (2019)	Limbitless Solutions, University of Central Florida, Oregon Health and Science University	United States	—
4	Evaluation of EMG pattern recognition for upper limb prosthesis control: a case study in comparison with direct myoelectric control (2018)	Boston University, Brown University, North Carolina State University	United States	—
5	Motor Control and Sensory Feedback Enhance Prosthesis Embodiment and Reduce Phantom Pain After Long-Term Hand Amputation (2018)	University of Utah	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
6	Prosthesis rejection in acquired major upper-limb amputees: A population-based survey (2012)	Innlandet Hospital Trust	Norway	—
7	Human Hand Anatomy-Based Prosthetic Hand (2020)	Czech Technical University in Prague, Hospital La Fe, Universitat Politècnica de València	Czech Republic, Spain	—
8	Prosthetic fitting, use, and satisfaction following lower-limb amputation: A prospective study (2012)	Spectrum Research Inc, Veterans Affairs Puget Sound Health Care System	United States	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The **S2** column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher provided a seminal synthesis of persistent pain in older adults, establishing a foundational framework that has been widely adopted by independent scholars in the field.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the publication of a comprehensive overview of persistent pain in older adults, published in American Psychologist in 2014. This work serves as the cornerstone of this specific line of inquiry, standing alone without direct follow-up papers by the same author in the provided dataset.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the work addresses a critical gap by synthesizing existing knowledge on a complex, multifaceted health issue affecting a vulnerable demographic. By providing an overview in a high-impact venue, the researcher appears to have consolidated fragmented literature into a coherent narrative, offering a new perspective or structural understanding of pain persistence in the elderly population.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work has achieved substantial recognition, evidenced by 428 citations. Notably, analysis of citing papers reveals that 91.7% originate from independent researchers, indicating that the contribution has resonated broadly across the scientific community rather than within a single institutional circle. This high degree of independent uptake underscores the work's utility and influence as a standard reference in the field.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Overview of Persistent Pain in Older Adults

2014 · American Psychologist · 428 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 251 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Psychology papers from 2014 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Individual differences in pain: understanding the mosaic that makes pain personal (2017)	University of Florida	United States	—
2	Chronic Pain in the Elderly: Mechanisms and Perspectives (2022)	Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul	Brazil	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
3	Collagen peptides supplementation improves function, pain, and physical and mental outcomes in active adults (2023)	Florida State University, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, University of North Carolina	United States	**Influential**

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The **S2** column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	2
Baylor College of Medicine	United States	SCImago #560	1
Oregon Health and Science University	United States	SCImago #689 · THE 351–400	1
North Carolina State University	United States	SCImago #484 · THE 301–350 · QS =272	1
University of Washington	United States	SCImago #45 · THE 25 · QS 81	1
Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul	Brazil	SCImago #4296	1
Boston University	United States	SCImago #272 · THE =76 · QS =88	1
University of Utah	United States	SCImago #320 · THE 201–250 · QS =540	1
Brown University	United States	SCImago #553 · THE 65 · QS 69	1
Florida State University	United States	SCImago #1224 · THE 301–350 · QS 549	1
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	United States	SCImago #2807	1
Czech Technical University in Prague	Czech Republic	SCImago #3263 · THE 1201–1500 · QS =416	1
Universitas Sebelas Maret	Indonesia	THE 1001–1200 · QS 1001-1200	1
Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City (IUH)	Vietnam	SCImago #6705 · QS 1201-1400	1
Universitat Politècnica de València	Spain	SCImago #808 · QS 422	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	7
Czech Republic	1
Indonesia	1
Brazil	1

Country	Citing papers
Spain	1
Vietnam	1
Norway	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	Prosthesis use in persons with lower- and upper-limb amputation	8	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Overview of Persistent Pain in Older Adults	3	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5