

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

## Stephanie Kovalchik

Zelus Analytics

[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

1	1	1	36
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 1 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	1
Self-citation	0
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 a risk-stratified framework for low-dose CT lung cancer screening, published in NEJM, which has garnered significant independent scholarly attention.*

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a methodology for targeting low-dose CT screening based on the specific risk of lung-cancer death, as detailed in a 2013 paper published in The New England Journal of Medicine.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the critical need for precision in screening protocols by moving beyond broad eligibility criteria. The title suggests a novel approach to stratifying patients according to their individual risk of mortality from lung cancer, thereby optimizing the allocation of screening resources.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated 675 citations, indicating substantial uptake within the medical community. Notably, the available citation data shows that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work’s broad impact and acceptance beyond the researcher’s immediate institutional circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

### CORE PAPER

#### [Targeting of Low-Dose CT Screening According to the Risk of Lung-Cancer Death](#)

2013 · The New England Journal of Medicine · 675 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 552 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2013 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Air Pollution and Lung Cancer: A Review by International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer Early Detection and Screening Committee</a> (2023)	All India Institute of Medical Sciences, British Columbia Cancer Agency and The University of British Columbia, British Columbia Cancer Research Institute	Canada, China, Hungary	—

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
University of Hong Kong	China	SCImago #195 · THE 33 · QS 11	1
All India Institute of Medical Sciences	India	SCImago #1342	1
Stony Brook University	United States	SCImago #993 · THE 301–350	1
Fudan University	China	SCImago #46 · THE 36 · QS 30	1
University of Virginia	United States	SCImago #451 · THE =166 · QS 275	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Brock University	Canada	SCImago #6013 · THE 1201–1500 · QS 1201-1400	1
Early Cancer Detection Consultant	—	—	1
The International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer	United States	—	1
National Korányi Institute for Pulmonology	Hungary	—	1
Rescue Lung Society	United States	—	1
British Columbia Cancer Research Institute	Canada	—	1
Zhongshan Hospital Fudan University	China	—	1
British Columbia Cancer Agency and The University of British Columbia	Canada	—	1

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Canada	1
China	1
Hungary	1
India	1
United States	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	Targeting of Low-Dose CT Screening According to the Risk of Lung-Cancer Death	1	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5