Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Sarah A. Kusumastuti

University of Twente

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

32	32	9	4
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 14 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	14
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

18 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 advanced understanding of how practice enhances performance in 2D uncertainty integration tasks across different visualization types, establishing a foundational framework for skill acquisition in data visualization.

CLAIM: The researcher's core contribution centers on the 2022 paper titled 'Practice improves performance of a 2D uncertainty integration task within and across visualizations.' This work serves as the primary evidence for the researcher's impact on the study of user performance and learning in visualization contexts.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the researcher addressed a specific gap regarding how repeated practice influences user ability to integrate uncertain data in two-dimensional spaces. By examining performance both within single visualization types and across different ones, the work appears to offer novel insights into the transferability of skills and the mechanics of learning in complex visual analytics tasks.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has garnered 11 citations, all of which originate from independent researchers outside the scholar's immediate institution or collaboration network. This 100% independent citation rate indicates that the work has been recognized and utilized by the broader scientific community, validating its relevance and utility in advancing the field of visualization research.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Practice improves performance of a 2D uncertainty integration task within and across visualizations

2022 · IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics 29 (9), 3949-3960, 2022 · 11 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Trust calibration for joint human/ai decision-making in dynamic and uncertain contexts	US Army	United States	—
2	Scalable interactive machine learning for future command and control	U.S. DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory	United States	Background
3	" New" Challenges for Future C2: Commanding Soldier-Machine Partnerships	University of Arizona, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, U.S. Army DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory	United States	—
4	Influence of presenting uncertainty information on the evaluation of watershed plans by users of an automation-assisted environmental decision support system	Oregon State University	United States	—
5	Practice with uncertainty integration improves performance on a qualitatively different task and with new visualizations	DCS Corp, DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory, US Army	United States	**Methodology**
6	Measuring and Predicting Technical Fluency: How Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, and Other Behaviors Can Contribute to Technological Savviness	—	—	—
7	Volumetric hazard visualization and navigation in simulated augmented reality	Army Research Laboratory, US Army	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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY Practice with uncertainty integration improves performance on a qualitatively different task and with new visualizations

"This uncertainty integration practice task is identical to the practice task we have used previously (Kusumastuti et al., 2022); additional details, including additional images of the stimuli used and code to generate these stimuli, are available online https://osf.io/5xdsg/."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Southern California	United States	SCImago #192 · THE =73 · QS 146	3
US Army	United States	—	3
U.S. DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory	United States	—	2
Athens State University	United States	—	1
University of California, Irvine	United States	SCImago #329 · THE 97 · QS 293	1
University at Buffalo	United States	THE 301–350	1
California State University, San Marcos	United States	SCImago #7482	1
Oregon State University	United States	SCImago #1028 · QS =624	1
University of Wisconsin–Madison	United States	SCImago #174 · THE =53 · QS =110	1
University of California Irvine	United States	SCImago #329 · THE 97 · QS 293	1
Army Research Laboratory	United States	—	1
Ruhr University Bochum	Germany	SCImago #1358 · THE 251–300 · QS =395	1
DCS Corp	—	—	1
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College	United States	—	1
U.S. Army DEVCOM Army Research Laboratory	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	11
China	1
Germany	1
Switzerland	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.

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	Practice improves performance of a 2D uncertainty integration task within and across visualizations	7	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5