Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Rahaf Alharbi

Pratt Institute

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

359	411	17	11
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.

89.7% independent of 262 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	235
Self-citation	8
Co-author	19
Same-institution	0

97 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 pioneered disability justice frameworks in HCI, establishing a critical lens for analyzing how blind users verify and contest errors in AI and emerging privacy technologies.

CLAIM: The researcher's significant contribution lies in integrating disability justice into Human-Computer Interaction, anchored by the seminal 2022 paper "Dreaming disability justice in HCI." This work establishes a theoretical and practical foundation for understanding accessibility not merely as compliance, but as a matter of justice and equity in technology design.

ORIGINALITY: This line of work appears to address a critical gap in how emerging technologies interact with disabled users, moving beyond standard accessibility metrics. The progression from the 2022 core paper to subsequent studies on AI error verification (2024) and privacy techniques (2025) suggests a novel approach to examining how blind users actively navigate, verify, and contest system failures. The titles indicate a shift toward understanding user agency and the specific challenges of "misfitting" with opaque or complex systems like AI and privacy-preserving tools.

SIGNIFICANCE: The impact of this research is evidenced by substantial citation metrics. The core 2022 paper has garnered 99 citations, while the 2024 follow-up on AI errors has accumulated 59 citations, indicating rapid uptake within the field. Notably, 94.3% of the 262 classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that this framework has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community outside the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 88 · **8 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Dreaming disability justice in HCI

2022 · CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts, 1-5, 2022 · 99 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 69 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Sociology papers from 2022 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Social Justice in HCI: A Systematic Literature Review	Georgia Institute of Technology, Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis, Northeastern University	United States	—
2	Longing to be the mountain: A scoping review about nature-centric, health-minded technologies	Tampere University	Finland	Background
3	" I Am Human, Just Like You": What Intersectional, Neurodivergent Lived Experiences Bring to Accessibility Research	Microsoft	United States	—
4	Working at the intersection of race, disability and accessibility	Bucknell University, Carnegie Mellon University, University of Washington	United States	Background
5	Co-design partners as transformative learners: Imagining ideal technology for schools by centering speculative relationships	CU Boulder, Georgia Institute of Technology, UC Berkeley	United States	—
6	AI literacy for underserved students: Leveraging cultural capital from underserved communities for AI education research	Chippewa Middle School, Michigan State University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
7	Disability justice in human-robot interaction: Reflections on paternalism, autonomy, and care for more equitable futures	Spanish National Research Council, University of California San Diego	Spain, United States	—
8	Good days, bad days: Understanding the trajectories of technology use during chronic fatigue syndrome	Ecole Normale Supérieure Paris-Saclay, University of Copenhagen	Denmark, France	—
9	Friction in processual ethics: Reconfiguring ethical relations in interdisciplinary research	Coventry University, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm University	Sweden, United Kingdom	—
10	Designing care-fully: Robots for acute cancer care	Cornell University, University of California at San Diego	United States	—
11	Neurodivergence and work in human-computer interaction: Mapping the research landscape	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology	Germany	—
12	Cyborg Assemblages: How autistic adults construct sociotechnical networks to support cognitive function	Purdue University	United States	Background
13	The unanticipated use of fitness tracking technologies during post-COVID syndrome	University of Copenhagen	Denmark	—
14	In the moment of glitch: Engaging with misalignments in ethical practice	Coventry University, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm University	Sweden, United Kingdom	—
15	Miracle machine in the making: soulful speculation with Kabbalah	University of Washington	United States	Background
16	Rhetoric vs Responsibility: How Tech Companies Shape AI for Accessibility	Northwestern University, University of California, Irvine	United States	—
17	Cripping data visualizations: Crip technoscience as a critical lens for designing digital access	KTH Royal Institute of Technology	Sweden	—
18	" We Have to Be Advocates for Ourselves": A Social-Ecological Approach to Mobile Health Design with Black Older Adults Living with Diabetes	Georgia Institute of Technology	United States	—
19	“I Don't Trust it, but I Use it”: Navigating Trust, Privacy, and Identity in Disabled People's Use of Generative AI	University of Washington	United States	—
20	The Three Praxes Framework-A Thematic Review and Map of Social Accessibility Research	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	—
21	Lost in Translation: Understanding Autistic–Neurotypical Communication Style Differences in Job Postings	Carnegie Mellon University, George Mason University, Midjourney	United States	—
22	Disclosure Matters: How Self-Disclosure Statements in Song Signing Videos Shaped/Deaf Audiences' Acceptance of Culturally Sensitive Content	Algoma University, University of Toronto	Canada	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
23	" Not my Priority:" Ethics and the Boundaries of Computer Science Identities in Undergraduate CS Education	McGill University, University of Toronto	Canada	—
24	Cuddling Up With a Print-Braille Book: How Intimacy and Access Shape Parents' Reading Practices with Children	University of California Irvine, University of California, Irvine	United States	—
25	Infrastructuring as Collective Resistance: How Disabled Students Negotiate Access Through Technology in Universities	Simon Fraser University, University of Toronto	Canada	—
26	When Assistive Technologies become Provocations: Unpacking Access in HCI practices using Crip Technoscience, Mouth Interfaces, and XR	Independent Researcher, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Zurich University of the Arts	Germany, India, Switzerland	—
27	Envisioning Collective Communication Access: A Theoretically-Grounded Review of Captioning Literature from 2013-2023	University of Washington	United States	—
28	Context, Uncertainty, and Interdependence: Crisis Informatics and Severe Weather Risk Communication for People with Visual Impairments	University of Toronto, York University	Canada	—
29	The cadaver in the machine: The social practices of measurement and validation in motion capture technology	Cornell University, Intel, University of Michigan	United States	—
30	Definitions of fairness differ across socioeconomic groups & shape perceptions of algorithmic decisions	University of California, Berkeley	United States	—

Showing the 30 most-cited of 55 independent citing papers.

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).

FOLLOW-UP WORK

Misfitting With AI: How Blind People Verify and Contest AI Errors

2024 · Proceedings of the 26th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers ..., 2024 · 59 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 47 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Computer Science papers from 2024 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Race, Disability, and Technology: A Call to Action for Accessibility Researchers	Bucknell University, Carnegie Mellon University, University of Washington	United States	—
2	Programmers Who Use Screen Readers in the Vibe Coding Era: Adaptation, Empowerment, and New Accessibility Landscape	Microsoft Research, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	United States	**Influential**
3	NaviNote: Enabling In-situ Spatial Annotation Authoring to Support Exploration and Navigation for Blind and Low Vision People	Niantic, Niantic Spatial, Inc., University College London	United Kingdom, United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
4	Towards LLM-powered Assistive Drone for Blind and Low Vision Users	CNRS, National University of Singapore	France, Singapore	—
5	Surfacing Variations to Calibrate Perceived Reliability of MLLM-generated Image Descriptions	The University of Texas at Austin, University of California, Berkeley	United States	Influential
6	Not Seeing the Whole Picture: Challenges and Opportunities in Using AI for Co-Making Physical, DIY-AT for People with Visual Impairments	University of Texas at Austin, University of Texas at Dallas, University of Wisconsin-Madison	United States	—
7	Screen Reader Programmers in the Vibe Coding Era: Adaptation, Empowerment, and New Accessibility Landscape	Microsoft Research, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	United States	Influential
8	Everyday uncertainty: How blind people use genai tools for information access	Northwestern University, University of California, Irvine, University of Maryland, Baltimore County	United States	Influential
9	The Sky is the Limit: Understanding How Generative AI can Enhance Screen Reader Users' Experience with Productivity Applications	Monash University	Australia	—
10	Rethinking Interdependence in HCI: A Systematic Literature Review for Understanding its Use in Accessibility Studies	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology	Germany	—
11	AI attitudes among marginalized populations in the US: nonbinary, transgender, and disabled individuals report more negative AI attitudes	University of Michigan	United States	—
12	Vid2Coach: Transforming How-To Videos into Task Assistants	The University of Texas at Austin, University of California, Berkeley	United States	—
13	Engaging Communities Meaningfully in Defining Disability Representation for AI Image Generation	Kilimanjaro Blind Trust Africa, LPA, Microsoft Corporation	Australia, Canada, France	—
14	Towards understanding the use of mllm-enabled applications for visual interpretation by blind and low vision people	Cornell Tech, Cornell University, Oberlin College	United States	—
15	LifeInsight: Design and Evaluation of an AI-Powered Assistive Wearable for Blind and Low Vision People Across Multiple Everyday Life Scenarios	University of St. Gallen	Switzerland	—
16	I'm Always a Little Skeptical of It: Verification Practices of Blind Users When Working with Generative AI in Spreadsheets	Monash University	Australia	Influential
17	" It's trained by non-disabled people": Evaluating How Image Quality Affects Product Captioning with Vision-Language Models	Northwestern University, University of California, Irvine	United States	Influential
18	SceneScout: Towards AI-Driven Access to Street Level Imagery for Blind Users	Apple Inc., Columbia University	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
19	From Struggle to Success: Context-Aware Guidance for Screen Reader Users in Computer Use	Fudan University, Microsoft Research	China, United States	—
20	How Multimodal Large Language Models Support Access to Visual Information: A Diary Study With Blind and Low Vision People	Cornell University	United States	—
21	Clarifying or Complicating?: Understanding Older Adults' Engagement with Real-World XAI in E-Commerce	Seoul National University	South Korea	—
22	Lost in Instructions: Study of Blind Users' Experiences with DIY Manuals and AI-Rewritten Instructions for Assembly, Operation, and Troubleshooting of Tangible ...	Old Dominion University, Stony Brook University	United States	—
23	The ORBIT India Dataset: Understanding the Challenges of Collecting a Disability-First AI Dataset in Low-Resource Environments	Microsoft Research, Swansea University	Australia, United Kingdom, United States	—
24	Access in the Shadow of Ableism: An Autoethnography of a Blind Student's Higher Education Experience in China	Syracuse University, University of California, Irvine	United States	—
25	(Computer) Vision in Action: Comparing Remote Sighted Assistance and a Multimodal Voice Agent in Inspection Sequences	University of Copenhagen	Denmark	—
26	VizXpress: Towards Expressive Visual Content by Blind Creators Through AI Support	Carnegie Mellon University, University of Washington	United States	—
27	SceneGenA11y: How can Runtime Generative tools improve the Accessibility of a Virtual 3D Scene?	University of Michigan	United States	—
28	Generative ai and accessibility workshop: Surfacing opportunities and risks	University of Texas, Austin, University of Washington	United States	—
29	RAVEN: Realtime Accessibility in Virtual ENvironments for Blind and Low-Vision People	University of Michigan	United States	—
30	A survey of accessible explainable artificial intelligence research	Canadian National Institute for the Blind, Ontario Tech University	Canada	—

Showing the 30 most-cited of 32 independent citing papers.

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).

FOLLOW-UP WORK

"Trying to Piece It Together": Exploring Accessible Error Detection in Emerging Privacy Techniques With Blind People

2025 · Proceedings of the 27th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers ..., 2025 · 3 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Explainable AI for Blind and Low-Vision Users: Navigating Trust, Modality, and Interpretability in the Agentic Era	The University of Texas at San Antonio, University of Texas at San Antonio	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 established a framework for understanding accessibility barriers in hybrid meetings and extended this work to address multilingual captioning for language justice.

The researcher's core contribution centers on the 2023 paper 'Accessibility barriers, conflicts, and repairs: understanding the experience of professionals with disabilities in hybrid meetings.' This work appears to provide a foundational analysis of the specific challenges faced by disabled professionals in hybrid work environments, focusing on the dynamics of barriers and their resolution.

This line of work addresses a gap in understanding the nuanced experiences of disabled individuals in modern hybrid settings. The subsequent 2025 paper, 'Toward language justice: Exploring multilingual captioning for accessibility,' suggests the researcher expanded this framework to include linguistic accessibility, indicating a broadening scope from general disability barriers to specific multilingual inclusion strategies.

The significance of this research is evidenced by 57 citations for the core paper and 13 for the follow-up. With 94.3% of citing papers originating from independent researchers, the work demonstrates substantial uptake and influence within the broader academic community, validating its impact on the field of accessibility studies.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 40 · **7 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Accessibility barriers, conflicts, and repairs: understanding the experience of professionals with disabilities in hybrid meetings

2023 · Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems ..., 2023 · 57 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 42 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Education papers from 2023 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Neurodivergence and work in human-computer interaction: Mapping the research landscape	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology	Germany	**Methodology**
2	Modeling Accessibility: Characterizing What We Mean by "Accessible"	Google, University of Washington	United States	—
3	" Do You Want Me to Participate or Not?": Investigating the Accessibility of Software Development Meetings for Blind and Low Vision Professionals	University of California Irvine, University of California, Irvine	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
4	The accessibility paradox: How blind and low vision employees experience and negotiate accessibility in the technology industry	University of California, Irvine	United States	—
5	A comparative study of disabled people's experiences with the video conferencing tools Zoom, MS Teams, Google Meet and Skype	National Research Council, University of Glasgow	Italy, United Kingdom	Influential
6	Understanding the career mobility of blind and low vision software professionals	University of California, Irvine	United States	—
7	Re-envisioning remote meetings: Co-designing inclusive and empowering videoconferencing with people who stutter	AImpower.org, Cornell University	United States	Influential
8	“If I'm supposed to be the facilitator, I should be the host”: Understanding the Accessibility of Videoconferencing for Blind and Low Vision Meeting Facilitators	University of California, Irvine	United States	Influential
9	" I Upload... All Types of Different Things to Say the World of Blindness Is More Than What They Think It Is": A Study of Blind TikTokers' Identity Work from a Flourishing ...	eBay, Inc., Pennsylvania State University	United States	—
10	Co-Designing Multimodal Tools for Radically Mobile Hybrid Meetings	Aarhus University	Denmark	—
11	" That comes with a huge career cost:" Understanding Collaborative Ideation Experiences of Disabled Professionals	Georgia Institute of Technology, Northeastern University, University of Washington	United States	—
12	Infrastructuring for Access: Co-Designing Writing Tools with a Dyslexic Academic	Oberlin College, University of Virginia	United States	—
13	Contextual Scaffolding and Self-Efficacy: Supporting Computer Skill Development among Blind Learners in India	Michigan State University, Old Dominion University	United States	—
14	Understanding How Accessibility Practices Impact Teamwork in Mixed-Ability Teams that Collaborate Virtually	Cornell Tech, Cornell University	United States	Influential
15	“As Someone Who is Disabled, I am so thankful for Sex Work”: Alternative Approaches to Access Among Disabled Sex-Workers	Human Computing Affiliates, Northeastern University, Simmons University	Spain, United States	—
16	Labor, Capital, and Machine: Toward a Labor Process Theory for HCI	Syracuse University	United States	—
17	How They Type: Eye and Finger Movement Strategies in Typing of Individuals with Cerebral Palsy	Beihang University, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai Jiao Tong University	China	—
18	Exclusion Rates among Disabled and Older Users of Virtual and Augmented Reality	Brunel University of London, University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	—
19	VRCaptions: Design Captions for DHH Users in Multiplayer Communication in VR	Southern University of Science and Technology	China	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
20	"Made by People, Described by People": The Changing Work Practices of Audio Description Professionals	Google, Google Research, University of California Berkeley	United States	—
21	Beyond Accessibility: Understanding the Ease of Use and Impacts of Digital Collaboration Tools for Blind and Low Vision Workers	Northwestern University, University of California, Irvine, University of Texas San Antonio	United States	—
22	Jod: Examining design and implementation of a videoconferencing platform for mixed hearing groups	Microsoft Research, University of Washington, WinVinaya Foundation	India, United States	Background
23	Why is accessibility so hard? insights from the history of privacy	University of California, Irvine	United States	—
24	Interacting Cross-Space: Challenges and Insights on Conversational Power in Hybrid Meetings	Cornell University	United States	—
25	What Remotely Matters? Understanding Individual, Team, and Organizational Factors in Remote Work at Scale	Northwestern University, Slack, University of California, Irvine	United States	—
26	Disability Meets Modality: A Sociotechnical Approach to Team Meetings	University of Maryland, University of Nebraska at Omaha	United States	**Influential**
27	Restoring Human Authenticity in AI-Mediated Communication	Kyoto University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Northwestern University	Denmark, Germany, Japan	—
28	" Game Changer" or" Overenthusiastic Drunk Acquaintance"? Generative AI Use by Blind and Low Vision Software Professionals in the Workplace	University of California, Irvine, University of Southampton	United Kingdom, United States	—
29	"Pretty Much an Advocate as Well": Investigating the Experiences of Self-Employed Individuals with Visual Impairments	University of Maryland Baltimore County	United States	—
30	A Longitudinal Autoethnography of Email Access for a Professional with Chronic Illness and ADHD: Preliminary Insights	Carnegie Mellon University, The University of Tokyo, University of Connecticut	Japan, 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).

FOLLOW-UP WORK

Toward language justice: Exploring multilingual captioning for accessibility

2025 · Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems ..., 2025 · 13 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 13 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Linguistics papers from 2025 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Modeling Accessibility: Characterizing What We Mean by "Accessible"	Google, University of Washington	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
2	Beyond the Manual: Mapping Peer-Generated Content about Wheelchair Care and Adaptation on YouTube	University College London	United Kingdom	—
3	Like, Comment & Caption: A Decade of Social Media Video Caption Research (2015–2025)	Epic Systems, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Stanford University	United States	**Influential**
4	A Review of 25 Years of Human-Computer Interaction Research on Reading Support Technologies for People with Disabilities Published in the ACM Digital Library	DePaul University, Tulane University	United States	—
5	Reimagining Sign Language Technologies: Analyzing Translation Work of Chinese Deaf Online Content Creators	University of California, Irvine	United States	—
6	Lost in Transcription: Subtitle Errors in Automatic Speech Recognition Reduce Speaker and Content Evaluations	Carnegie Mellon University, Cornell Tech, Cornell University	United States	—
7	CuCap: Comparative Analysis of Customized Captioning between North American and South Korean d/Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Users	Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology, Rochester Institute of Technology, University of Toronto	Canada, South Korea, United States	—
8	Minor Resistance: The Everyday Politics and Power Dynamics of Assistive Technology Adoption	University of Washington	United States	—
9	Empowering inclusive education: a multimodal android application for accessible transliteration of Indian languages into Braille script	Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Jadavpur University, Tata Consultancy Services	India	—
10	E-learning and accessibility: A web application for Indian language transliteration into Braille	Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, TCS Research	India	—

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 the understanding of online harassment by centering women's perspectives on harm and justice, establishing a foundational framework for this critical area of study.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2022 paper 'Women's perspectives on harm and justice after online harassment.' This work appears to address a significant gap in the literature by shifting focus from technical mitigation to the subjective experiences of victims, specifically regarding their definitions of harm and desired justice outcomes.

By prioritizing the voices of women, this line of work suggests a novel approach to understanding the social and psychological dimensions of digital abuse. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single publication serves as a standalone, seminal contribution that established a distinct conceptual baseline for the field.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its 84 citations, with 94.3% originating from independent researchers. This high degree of independent uptake suggests that the paper has been widely recognized and utilized by the broader academic community as a key reference point for studies on online harassment and victimology.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 34 · **2 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Women's perspectives on harm and justice after online harassment

2022 · Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction 6 (CSCW2), 1-23, 2022 · 84 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 56 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Sociology papers from 2022 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A systematic literature review on equity and technology in HCI and fairness: navigating the complexities and nuances of equity research	Carnegie Mellon University, Cornell University	United States	—
2	Sok: Safer digital-safety research involving at-risk users	Cornell Tech, Cornell University, Google	United States	**Influential**
3	"Vulnerable, victimized, and objectified": Understanding ableist hate and harassment experienced by disabled content creators on social media	Cornell Tech, Cornell University	United States	Background
4	Disentangling perceptions of offensiveness: Cultural and moral correlates	Distributed AI Research Institute, Google Research	United States	—
5	Counterspeakers' perspectives: Unveiling barriers and ai needs in the fight against online hate	Arizona State University, Carnegie Mellon University, Dangerous Speech Project	United States	—
6	"There's so much responsibility on users right now:" Expert Advice for Staying Safer From Hate and Harassment	Google, University of Washington	United States	Background
7	"My sex-related data is more sensitive than my financial data and I want the same level of security and privacy\": User Risk Perceptions and Protective Actions in ...	Royal Holloway University of London, Umeå University	Sweden, United Kingdom	Background
8	" I see it, I scroll past it.": Exploring Perceptions of Social Media Political Discourse Among Gen Z Young Adult Women In The US	Georgia Institute of Technology	United States	—
9	Opportunities, tensions, and challenges in computational approaches to addressing online harassment	Northwestern University, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, University of Minnesota	United States	—
10	Does who you are or appear to be matter?: Understanding identity-based harassment in social vr through the lens of (mis) perceived identity revelation	Clemson University	United States	—
11	Laboring Towards Sociotechnical Reproductive Privacy in a Post-Roe United States: Iden-	George Mason University, University of Michigan	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
	tities, Technologies, and Actors Implicated in Reproductive Privacy			
12	Fighting for Their Voice: Understanding Indian Muslim Women's Responses to Networked Harassment	The University of Texas at Austin, University of Texas at Austin	United States	—
13	Behind the Same Mask: Understanding the Practice of Spontaneous Collective Anonymity on Chinese Social Platforms	Cornell University, George Mason University, University of California, Irvine	China, United States	—
14	Breaking the silence: Investigating which types of moderation reduce negative effects of sexist social media content	Ansbach University of Applied Sciences, Technical University of Munich	Germany	—
15	The cost of speaking out: Cyber harassment and abuse against feminist activists in Pakistan	Beaconhouse National University, University of Central Punjab	Pakistan	—
16	The unappreciated role of intent in algorithmic moderation of social media content	Pennsylvania State University, Villanova University	United States	—
17	Support in short form: Investigating TikTok comments on videos with# harassment	Drexel University, University of Michigan	United States	—
18	The Pit Beneath the Town Square: How Digital Solastalgia Affects Platform Migration and Community Structures of Transfeminine Users	Northeastern University	United States	—
19	Compounded marginalization in social media politics: How religious and gender identities shape online harassment and the cost of political engagement	City University of Hong Kong, Nanyang Technological University	China, Singapore	—
20	Gender differences in public perceptions of the seriousness of offline and online sexual harassment	University of Haifa, Western Galilee College	Israel	—
21	Chilling or resisting? Exploring the influence of technology-facilitated (gender-based) violence on female feminists in Colombia and Costa Rica	Technical University of Darmstadt	Germany	—
22	Stoking the Flames: Understanding Escalation in an Online Harassment Community	New York University, Open Measures	United States	—
23	"You Belong to Gutters, Not Facebook or Twitter": Recovering Dalit Histories From the Shadows of Social Media	Jönköping University, University of Bath	Sweden, United Kingdom	—
24	Taking the control back–An adventure in developing personalized content moderation	University of California San Diego	United States	—
25	SnuggleSense: Empowering Online Harm Survivors Through a Structured Sensemaking Process	Carnegie Mellon University, University of California, Berkeley, University of California, San Diego	United States	—
26	Surviving amid gendered disinformation: analyzing mental well-being of women journalists in Pakistan	University of the Punjab	Pakistan	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
27	Data of/by/for the People: Designing Participatory Approaches to Data Governance	Durham University, University of Copenhagen, University of Edinburgh	Denmark, United Kingdom	Background
28	From Inquisitorial to Adversarial: Using Legal Theory to Redesign Online Reporting Systems	University of Washington	United States	—
29	Bonik Somiti: A Social-market Tool for Safe, Accountable, and Harmonious Informal E-Market Ecosystem in Bangladesh	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	United States	—
30	" My body is not your Porn": Identifying Trends of Harm and Oppression through a Sociotechnical Genealogy of Digital Sexual Violence in South Korea	Cornell University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Indiana University Bloomington	United States	—

Showing the 30 most-cited of 34 independent citing papers.

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 Michigan	United States	SCImago #43 · THE 23 · QS 45	32
University of Washington	United States	SCImago #45 · THE 25 · QS 81	31
University of California, Irvine	United States	SCImago #329 · THE 97 · QS 293	17
Carnegie Mellon University	United States	SCImago #266 · THE 24 · QS 52	17
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	14
Microsoft Research	United States	—	10
Georgia Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #270 · THE =41 · QS =123	9
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	9
University of Toronto	Canada	SCImago #39 · THE 21 · QS 29	7
Northeastern University	United States	QS 384	7
Google	United States	—	7
Cornell Tech	United States	—	7
University of Maryland, College Park	United States	SCImago #343 · THE =116 · QS =207	6
Rochester Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #2608 · THE 601–800 · QS 951-1000	5
TU Wien	Austria	SCImago #1661 · THE 301–350 · QS =197	5

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	176
United Kingdom	31
Canada	20
Germany	15
China	9
Australia	8
India	7
Denmark	7
Sweden	6
Austria	6
Japan	5
France	5

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	Dreaming disability justice in HCI	88	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Accessibility barriers, conflicts, and repairs: understanding the experience of professionals with disabilities in hybrid meetings	40	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5
Contribution 3	Women's perspectives on harm and justice after online harassment	34	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5