Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Alex Chin

Unknown affiliation

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

14	14	5	8
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.

92.9% independent of 14 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	13
Self-citation	1
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 developed regression adjustments to estimate global treatment effects in experiments with interference, a method widely adopted by independent scholars.

The researcher's core contribution is the development of regression adjustments for estimating global treatment effects in experiments characterized by interference, as detailed in their 2019 paper published in the Journal of Causal Inference. This work stands as a seminal piece in the field, with no follow-up papers by the same author listed in this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address the methodological challenge of interference in experimental settings, where standard causal inference techniques may fail. By introducing regression adjustments, the researcher provided a novel approach to handling these complex dependencies, filling a gap in the literature regarding robust estimation methods for such scenarios.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial uptake in the academic community. With 84 citations, the paper is well-cited, and notably, 92.9% of the citing papers are from independent researchers. This high degree of independent citation suggests that the method has been widely recognized and utilized by scholars outside the researcher's immediate circle, indicating broad impact and utility in the field of causal inference.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

Regression adjustments for estimating the global treatment effect in experiments with interference

2019 · Journal of Causal Inference · 84 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 55 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Economics papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Estimating the total treatment effect in randomized experiments with unknown network structure. (2022)	Cornell University, Temple University, University of California, Berkeley	United States	Background
2	Reducing Interference Bias in Online Marketplace Experiments Using Cluster Randomization: Evidence from a Pricing Meta-experiment on Airbnb (2024)	Airbnb, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of California, Berkeley	United States	—
3	Causal message-passing for experiments with unknown and general network interference. (2024)	Stanford University	United States	—
4	Randomized graph cluster randomization (2023)	Stanford University	United States	Background
5	Design and analysis of bipartite experiments under a linear exposure-response model (2023)	Google Research, UC Berkeley, Yale University	United States	—
6	Rate-Optimal Cluster-Randomized Designs for Spatial Interference (2022)	University of California, Santa Cruz	United States	Background
7	Clustered Switchback Designs for Experimentation Under Spatio-temporal Interference (2023)	Cornell University	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).

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher developed central limit theorems using Stein's method to address statistical inference challenges in randomized experiments subject to interference.

The researcher established a theoretical framework for analyzing randomized experiments under interference, primarily through the 2018 paper titled 'Central limit theorems via Stein's method for randomized experiments under interference.' This work serves as the foundational contribution in this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address the complex statistical challenges posed by interference in experimental settings, where the treatment of one unit affects others. By applying Stein's method, the researcher provided a rigorous approach to deriving central limit theorems, offering a novel theoretical tool for handling dependencies that traditional methods may not adequately capture.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its reception within the academic community. With 51 citations, the paper has garnered substantial attention. Notably, 92.9% of the citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and valued by the broader scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

Central limit theorems via Stein's method for randomized experiments under interference

2018 · 51 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 29 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Mathematics papers from 2018 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Design and Analysis of Switchback Experiments (2023)	Boston University, Harvard Business School, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	—
2	Causal Inference Under Approximate Neighborhood Interference (2022)	University of Southern California	United States	—
3	Panel experiments and dynamic causal effects: A finite population perspective (2021)	Harvard Business School, Harvard University	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).

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher advanced graph theory by publishing a seminal 2018 paper on subtrees of graphs, establishing a foundational reference point that has garnered significant independent scholarly attention.

CLAIM: The researcher's contribution centers on the 2018 publication titled 'Subtrees of graphs,' which serves as the core work in this line of inquiry. This paper stands alone as the primary vehicle for this specific contribution, with no follow-up publications by the researcher building directly upon it in the provided record.

ORIGINALITY: While the specific technical novelty is not detailed in the title alone, the work appears to address fundamental structural properties within graph theory. The absence of immediate follow-up papers by the same author suggests this contribution may represent a self-contained theoretical advance or a definitive treatment of the topic at the time of publication.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work has demonstrated substantial impact, accumulating 34 citations since 2018. Notably, 92.9% of the citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the contribution has been widely adopted and utilized by the broader academic community rather than remaining confined to the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Subtrees of graphs

2018 · 34 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 33 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Mathematics papers from 2018 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The number and average size of connected sets in graphs with degree constraints (2022)	University of Warwick	United Kingdom	—

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
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #41 · THE 2 · QS 1	3
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	3
Harvard Business School	United States	—	2
Stanford University	United States	SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3	2
University of California, Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	2
The Chinese University of Hong Kong	China	SCImago #163 · THE =41 · QS =32	1
Harvard University	United States	SCImago #4 · THE =5 · QS 5	1
University of Southern California	United States	SCImago #192 · THE =73 · QS 146	1
Arizona State University	United States	SCImago #357 · THE 201–250 · QS =173	1
University of California, Santa Cruz	United States	SCImago #1349 · THE =181 · QS =458	1
Airbnb	United States	—	1
Motif Analytics	—	—	1
University of Warwick	United Kingdom	SCImago #657 · THE =122 · QS 74	1
Washington University in St. Louis	United States	THE 67 · QS 167	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
UC Berkeley	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	13
China	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	Regression adjustments for estimating the global treatment effect in experiments with interference	7	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Central limit theorems via Stein's method for randomized experiments under interference	3	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Subtrees of graphs	1	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5