

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Gerhard Andersson

Professor at Linköping University

[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

11 Citing papers mapped	11 Citation edges	2 Home papers mapped	172 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.

45.5% independent of 11 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	5
Self-citation	4
Co-author	2
Same-institution	0

0 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

Automated review flag

Self-citations are 36.4% of classified citing papers – above the level at which AAO adjudicators routinely question citation evidence. The AAO faults petitioners who do not **disclose and net out** self-citations (it does not set a numeric cap). Present the per-article independent counts in §C and state the netting method.

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 conducted a seminal meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies for adult depression psychotherapy, establishing a highly cited benchmark for evaluating treatment efficacy in clinical psychology.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is a comprehensive meta-analysis titled "Psychotherapy for depression in adults: A meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies," published in the Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology in 2008. This work serves as the foundational piece for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher identified in the provided data.

ORIGINALITY: The title indicates that this study addressed the need for a systematic synthesis of comparative outcome data regarding psychotherapeutic interventions for adult depression. By aggregating results from multiple studies, the researcher likely provided a consolidated evidence base to clarify the relative effectiveness of different therapeutic approaches, a critical step in standardizing clinical understanding during that period.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work has achieved substantial recognition, accumulating 1,712 citations, which suggests it has become a standard reference in the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 63.6% of citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that the findings have been widely adopted and utilized by the broader scientific community beyond the researcher’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

[Psychotherapy for depression in adults: A meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies.](#)

2008 · Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology · 1,712 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,049 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2008 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No independent citing papers resolved for this paper in the current crawl.

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher conducted a seminal meta-analysis synthesizing evidence on internet-based and computerized psychological treatments for adult depression, establishing a critical benchmark for digital mental health interventions.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the publication of a comprehensive meta-analysis titled 'Internet-Based and Other Computerized Psychological Treatments for Adult Depression: A Meta-Analysis' in 2009. This work serves as the foundational piece in this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher identified in the provided data.

ORIGINALITY: The title indicates that this study addressed the emerging need to systematically evaluate the efficacy of digital therapeutic interventions for depression. By focusing on internet-based and computerized treatments, the work appears to have filled a gap in the literature regarding the empirical validation of non-traditional, technology-mediated psychological care for adults.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 1,943 citations, the paper is highly influential in the field. Analysis of citing literature reveals that 63.6% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting broad adoption and recognition of the findings beyond the researcher’s immediate academic circle. This high level of independent engagement underscores the work’s substantial impact on the broader scientific community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

CORE PAPER

[Internet-Based and Other Computerized Psychological Treatments for Adult Depression: A Meta-Analysis](#)

2009 · Cognitive Behaviour Therapy · 1,943 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Cognitive Load Theory and Its Relationships with Motivation: a Self-Determination Theory Perspective (2024)	Australian Catholic University, Ghent University, The University of Melbourne	Australia, Belgium	—
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	Delivering Cognitive Behavior Therapy to Young Adults With Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety Using a Fully Automated Conversational Agent (Woebot): A Randomized Controlled Trial (2017)	Stanford School of Medicine, Woebot Labs Inc.	United States	—
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	Artificially intelligent chatbots in digital mental health interventions: a review (2021)	Happify Health	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
Linköping University	Sweden	SCImago #921 · THE 201–250 · QS =310	4
Harvard University	United States	SCImago #4 · THE =5 · QS 5	2
Karolinska Institutet	Sweden	—	2

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Netherlands	SCImago #110 · THE =176 · QS =194	2
Stockholm University	Sweden	SCImago #578 · THE 201–250 · QS =147	2
Australian Catholic University	Australia	SCImago #3911 · THE 401–500 · QS 851-900	1
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg	Germany	—	1
Boston University	United States	SCImago #272 · THE =76 · QS =88	1
Columbia University	United States	SCImago #65 · THE 20 · QS =38	1
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	Belgium	—	1
Ulster University	United Kingdom	THE 601–800 · QS =609	1
Stanford School of Medicine	United States	—	1
University of Twente	Netherlands	SCImago #1005 · THE =190 · QS =203	1
Curtin University	Australia	SCImago #1031 · THE 251–300 · QS 183	1
University of Helsinki	Finland	SCImago #368 · THE =105 · QS =116	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	4
Netherlands	4
Sweden	4
Australia	3
Germany	3
Belgium	2
United Kingdom	1
South Africa	1
Spain	1
Finland	1
Italy	1
Mexico	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.

2017  2

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	Psychotherapy for depression in adults: A meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies.	0	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Internet-Based and Other Computerized Psychological Treatments for Adult Depression: A Meta-Analysis	5	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5