

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1A Petition — Original Contributions of Major Significance

8 CFR § 204.5(h)(3)(v) · Criterion 5

## Johan Ugander

Associate Professor, Statistics & Data Science, Yale University

[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

2	2	1	27
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 2 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	2
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 advanced the understanding of how social network structures influence contagion dynamics, as evidenced by a highly cited seminal paper in PNAS.*

The researcher's contribution centers on the analysis of structural diversity within social contagion processes. This work is anchored by a core paper published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in 2012, which stands as the primary vehicle for this specific research claim.

This line of work appears to address the complex relationship between network topology and the spread of phenomena. By focusing on structural diversity, the research suggests a move beyond homogeneous models, offering a more nuanced framework for understanding how varied social structures impact contagion. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single publication encapsulates the core theoretical advance.

The significance of this contribution is reflected in its substantial citation count, indicating broad uptake within the scientific community. Furthermore, the citation analysis reveals that all classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's impact beyond the researcher's immediate circle and confirming its independent recognition in the field.

### INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

#### CORE PAPER

#### [Structural diversity in social contagion](#)

2012 · Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A · 892 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 662 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Sociology papers from 2012 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">The structure and dynamics of networks with higher order interactions</a> (2023)	Institute for Complex Systems, Italian National Research Council (CNR), Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, University of Naples Federico II	Italy, Spain	—
2	<a href="#">Threats, challenges and sustainable conservation strategies for freshwater biodiversity</a> (2022)	Asian University for Women, HUTECH University, Sri Sivasubramaniya Nadar College of Engineering	Australia, Bangladesh, 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).

## D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

### Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Naples Federico II	Italy	THE 301–350 · QS =379	1
University of Newcastle	Australia	SCImago #1436 · THE 251–300	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Technology Sydney	Australia	SCImago #475 · THE =145 · QS 96	1
Institute for Complex Systems, Italian National Research Council (CNR)	Italy	—	1
Universidad Rey Juan Carlos	Spain	SCImago #2404 · QS 1001-1200	1
Asian University for Women	Bangladesh	—	1
Sri Sivasubramaniya Nadar College of Engineering	India	—	1
HUTECH University	Vietnam	SCImago #4347	1

## Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Australia	1
Bangladesh	1
India	1
Italy	1
Spain	1
Vietnam	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.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Core paper</b>	<b>Indep. cites</b>	<b>Supports</b>
Contribution 1	Structural diversity in social contagion	2	8 CFR 204.5(h)(3)(v) – Criterion 5