

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Nancy Adler

UCSF

[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

19	19	2	128
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.

84.2% independent of 19 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	16
Self-citation	0
Co-author	3
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 established the socioeconomic gradient in health, demonstrating that health disparities persist across all levels of social hierarchy rather than being limited to poverty.

The researcher's seminal contribution centers on the 1994 paper 'Socioeconomic status and health: the challenge of the gradient,' published in *American Psychologist*. This work articulates the concept that health outcomes decline steadily as socioeconomic status decreases, challenging previous assumptions that health disparities were confined to the lowest economic strata.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in understanding the structural nature of health inequality. By framing the issue as a 'gradient,' the research suggests a fundamental, continuous relationship between social position and health, moving beyond binary comparisons of poor versus non-poor populations. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single publication serves as the definitive theoretical anchor for this specific conceptual framework.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 5,335, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad impact across diverse academic institutions and its status as a foundational reference for independent scholars studying health disparities.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

[Socioeconomic status and health: the challenge of the gradient.](#)

1994 · *American Psychologist* · 5,335 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 3,394 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Sociology papers from 1994 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Social Class, Solipsism, and Contextualism: How the Rich Are Different From the Poor (2012)	University of California, Berkeley, University of Illinois	United States	—
2	The Power of Personality: The Comparative Validity of Personality Traits, Socioeconomic Status, and Cognitive Ability for Predicting Important Life Outcomes (2007)	Oregon Research Institute, University of Illinois, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	Methodology
3	Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators (1998)	Rockefeller University	United States	—
4	Social conditions as fundamental causes of disease (1995)	Columbia University	United States	—
5	Biomaterials for Drug Delivery and Human Applications (2024)	University of Naples Federico II	Italy	Background
6	Capturing Causal Complexity: Heuristics for Configurational Theorizing (2021)	City, University of London, London Business School, Louisiana State University	United Kingdom, United States	—
7	Power, approach, and inhibition. (2003)	Stanford University, University of California, Berkeley	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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Citing-text excerpts – how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY The Power of Personality: The Comparative Validity of Personality Traits, Socioeconomic Status, and Cognitive Ability for Predicting Important Life Outcomes

“We chose to use SES as a comparison because it is widely accepted to be one of the most important contributors to a more successful life, including better health and higher occupational attainment (e.g., Adler et al., 1994; Gallo & Mathews, 2003; Galobardes, Lynch, & Smith, 2004; Sapolsky, 2005).”

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established a foundational framework linking subjective and objective social status to psychological and physiological functioning in healthy women.

CLAIM: The researcher’s seminal 2000 publication in Health Psychology, titled ‘Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women,’ serves as the core contribution of this line of work. This paper appears to define the specific intersection of social stratification metrics and health outcomes.

ORIGINALITY: By explicitly distinguishing between subjective and objective social status, this work addresses a critical gap in understanding how perceived versus measured social standing influences health. The title suggests a pioneering effort to quantify these distinct dimensions within a specific demographic, offering a nuanced approach to social epidemiology that likely preceded broader adoption of such dual-status frameworks.

SIGNIFICANCE: With over 6,600 citations, this paper is highly influential in its field. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional clustering. This extensive independent uptake underscores the paper’s role as a standard reference in health psychology.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 9

CORE PAPER

[Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women.](#)

2000 · Health Psychology · 6,609 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 4,193 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2000 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Income inequality and health: A causal review (2015)	University of Nottingham, University of York	United Kingdom	Background
2	COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK: the Oxford coronavirus explanations, attitudes, and narratives survey (Oceans) II (2020)	Loughborough University, Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, University of Bristol	United Kingdom	Background
3	The psychology of social class: How socioeconomic status impacts thought, feelings, and behaviour (2018)	Cardiff University	United Kingdom	—
4	Analysis of COVID-19 Vaccine Type and Adverse Effects Following Vaccination (2021)	University of California, San Francisco, University of California San Francisco School of Pharmacy	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
5	The Psychology of Working Theory. (2016)	Boston College, University of Florida, University of Michigan	United States	—
6	A global study of pain prevalence across 52 countries: examining the role of country-level contextual factors (2022)	Halifax Health, Mount Saint Vincent University, University at Buffalo, SUNY	Canada, United States	—
7	Is the Desire for Status a Fundamental Human Motive? A Review of the Empirical Literature. (2015)	University of California, Berkeley	United States	—
8	The social psychology of stigma (2005)	University of California-Santa Barbara	United States	Background
9	Studying Socioeconomic Status: Conceptual Problems and an Alternative Path Forward (2023)	University of California, Berkeley	United States	Background

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 California, Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	4
University of California, San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	3
University of Illinois	United States	—	2
Columbia University	United States	SCImago #65 · THE 20 · QS =38	2
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	SCImago #63 · THE =3 · QS 6	1
Boston College	United States	SCImago #3099 · THE 251–300 · QS =526	1
Cardiff University	United Kingdom	SCImago #664 · THE 201–250 · QS 181	1
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	1
University of Naples Federico II	Italy	THE 301–350 · QS =379	1
Louisiana State University	United States	THE 601–800 · QS 851-900	1
Northeastern University	United States	QS 384	1
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	1
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	SCImago #206 · THE =41	1
University of Pittsburgh	United States	SCImago #212 · QS =281	1
University of California San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	15
United Kingdom	4
Canada	1
Italy	1
Singapore	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	Socioeconomic status and health: the challenge of the gradient.	7	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5
Contribution 2	Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women.	9	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5