Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

Francisco Chiclana

Professor of Computational Intelligence and Decision Making, De Montfort University, UK

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

5	5	1	92
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.

80.0% independent of 5 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	4
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 established foundational consistency criteria for fuzzy preference relations, a seminal contribution that has significantly influenced decision-making methodologies.

The researcher's core contribution rests on the 2004 paper 'Some issues on consistency of fuzzy preference relations,' published in the European Journal of Operational Research. This work addresses fundamental theoretical challenges regarding the logical coherence of preferences in fuzzy environments, a critical area for multi-criteria decision analysis. By examining consistency issues, the researcher provided essential theoretical grounding that helps resolve ambiguities in how preferences are modeled and aggregated when certainty is lacking. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests this single publication serves as a definitive, standalone theoretical anchor rather than the start of a prolonged iterative series. The work's significance is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,238, indicating it has become a standard reference in the field. Furthermore, the high degree of citation independence, with 80% of classified citations coming from independent researchers, demonstrates that the contribution has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

Some issues on consistency of fuzzy preference relations

2004 · European Journal of Operational Research · 1,238 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 999 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Mathematics papers from 2004 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A review of soft consensus models in a fuzzy environment (2014)	Distance Learning University of Spain (UNED), Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, University of Granada	Poland, Spain	**Methodology**
2	Introduction to the Analytic Hierarchy Process (2015)	—	—	Background
3	Uncertain Multi-Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications (2015)	—	—	—
4	A consensus model for large-scale group decision making with hesitant fuzzy information and changeable clusters (2018)	—	—	—

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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY A review of soft consensus models in a fuzzy environment

"Fortunately, the lack of consistency can be quantified and monitored [13,64,65], and it has been used as a parameter to validate the final solution obtained after consensus reaching process [13,16,62,63]."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Granada	Spain	THE 601–800 · QS =401	2
Sichuan University	China	SCImago #32 · THE 201–250 · QS =324	1
Distance Learning University of Spain (UNED)	Spain	—	1
Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences	Poland	SCImago #8924	1
De Montfort University	United Kingdom	SCImago #3147 · THE 601–800 · QS 801-850	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Spain	2
China	1
Poland	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).

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	Some issues on consistency of fuzzy preference relations	4	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) — Criterion 5