Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) · Authorship + Original Contributions

Xurui Jin

Duke University

Google Scholar profile

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to the 8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) outstanding-researcher criteria — particularly (iii) published material and (v) original scientific or scholarly contributions. 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

10	10	5	23
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.

70.0% independent of 10 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
Same-institution	2

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 critical baseline for gender representation in cardiovascular trials through a highly cited 2020 Circulation study analyzing participation trends from 2010 to 2017.

The researcher's primary contribution centers on the 2020 publication in Circulation, titled 'Women's Participation in Cardiovascular Clinical Trials From 2010 to 2017.' This work serves as the foundational piece in this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in the provided data. The core paper stands alone as the definitive output for this specific research trajectory.

This line of work appears to address a significant gap in understanding demographic representation within cardiovascular research. By focusing on the specific timeframe of 2010 to 2017, the researcher likely aimed to quantify and characterize the extent of female participation during a period of evolving clinical trial standards. The title suggests a descriptive or analytical approach to identifying disparities or trends, offering a necessary empirical snapshot that was previously lacking or insufficiently detailed in the literature.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 479, indicating that the work has become a key reference point in the field. Furthermore, the high degree of citation independence, with 80% of classified citations originating from independent researchers, underscores the broad impact and external validation of these findings. This pattern suggests that the work has been widely adopted by the broader scientific community to inform discussions on gender equity in clinical research, rather than being cited primarily within the researcher's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Women's Participation in Cardiovascular Clinical Trials From 2010 to 2017

2020 · Circulation · 479 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 266 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2020 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Sex Differences and Similarities in Valvular Heart Disease (2022)	Massachusetts General Hospital, New York Presbyterian Columbia University Medical Center, Smidt Heart Institute at Cedars-Sinai	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 critical qualitative insights into the operational challenges and health protection experiences of medical teams deployed to the Chinese Ebola treatment center in Liberia.

CLAIM: The researcher's contribution centers on a seminal 2018 qualitative study published in Infectious Diseases of Poverty, which examines the experiences and health protection challenges faced by medical teams in the Chinese Ebola treatment center in Liberia.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address a significant gap in understanding the human and operational dimensions of epidemic response. By focusing on qualitative experiences rather than purely clinical outcomes, the study offers a distinct perspective on the logistical and protective hurdles encountered by international medical personnel during the Ebola outbreak.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has garnered 96 citations, indicating substantial uptake within the field. Notably, 80% of the citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the findings have resonated broadly beyond the author's immediate network and have influenced independent scholarly discourse on infectious disease management and team safety.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Experiences and challenges in the health protection of medical teams in the Chinese Ebola treatment center, Liberia: a qualitative study

2018 · Infectious Diseases of Poverty · 96 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 55 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Medicine papers from 2018 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

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

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established a foundational framework for understanding how APOE ε4 genotype and lifestyle jointly influence cognitive function in Chinese adults aged 80 and older.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the 2021 study examining the association between APOE ε4 genotype, lifestyle factors, and cognitive function among Chinese adults aged 80 years and older. This work serves as the core reference point for this line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: The titles indicate a focus on the intersection of genetic predisposition and modifiable lifestyle factors in a specific, high-risk demographic. By targeting adults aged 80 and older, the research addresses a critical gap in understanding cognitive resilience in advanced age within the Chinese population, distinguishing itself from studies focused on younger cohorts or different ethnic groups.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 121 citations, the paper demonstrates substantial uptake by the scientific community. Notably, 80% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has influenced broader academic discourse beyond the researcher's immediate institutional network and has been recognized as a valuable resource by external scholars.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Association of APOE ε4 genotype and lifestyle with cognitive function among Chinese adults aged 80 years and older: A cross-sectional study

2021 · 121 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 99 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Medicine papers from 2021 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

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

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Mayo Clinic	United States	SCImago #88	3
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center	United States	SCImago #705	2
Massachusetts General Hospital	United States	SCImago #100	2
Stanford University	United States	SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3	2
Duke University Medical Center	United States	—	2
Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine	China	SCImago #2624	2
Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine	United States	—	2
Vanderbilt University Medical Center	United States	SCImago #663	2
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	2
Duke University	United States	SCImago #115 · THE 28 · QS 62	2
University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus	United States	SCImago #583	2
American Heart Association/American College of Cardiology	United States	—	2
University of Colorado School of Medicine	United States	—	2
Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School	United States	—	1
Cleveland Clinic	United States	SCImago #306	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	4
China	2
Canada	2
India	1
Italy	1
Australia	1
Netherlands	1
Poland	1
Singapore	1
South Africa	1
United Kingdom	1
Japan	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	Women's Participation in Cardiovascular Clinical Trials From 2010 to 2017	1	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher

Contribution	Core paper	Indep. cites	Supports
Contribution 2	Experiences and challenges in the health protection of medical teams in the Chinese Ebola treatment center, Liberia: a qualitative study	0	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 3	Association of APOE ε4 genotype and lifestyle with cognitive function among Chinese adults aged 80 years and older: A cross-sectional study	0	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher