

Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) · Authorship + Original Contributions

Amber Belcher

University of Delaware

[Google Scholar profile](#)

Generated 2026-06-10 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to the 8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) outstanding-researcher criteria — particularly (iii) published material and (v) original scientific or scholarly contributions. 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

29	29	4	5
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.

96.6% independent of 29 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	28
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
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 dyadic coping in early-stage breast cancer by examining how daily support mechanisms help couples maintain intimacy during health-related adversity.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2011 publication in Health Psychology titled 'Daily support in couples coping with early stage breast cancer: maintaining intimacy during adversity.' This work appears to establish a framework for understanding the intersection of daily interpersonal support and relationship quality during the initial phases of cancer treatment. By focusing on the maintenance of intimacy, the study addresses a critical yet often overlooked dimension of patient and partner adjustment to serious illness.

This line of work appears to address a gap in the literature regarding the micro-level, day-to-day processes that sustain couple relationships under the stress of a cancer diagnosis. While broader studies often examine general coping or long-term outcomes, this research suggests a novel focus on how specific daily support behaviors function as a buffer for intimacy. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single publication serves as a standalone, seminal contribution that defined a specific niche in health psychology without requiring extensive subsequent refinement by the author.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation record, with 136 citations indicating sustained academic interest. Notably, 96.6% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the findings have been widely adopted and built upon by the broader scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle. This high degree of independent uptake underscores the work's influence on the field's understanding of dyadic coping mechanisms.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

[Daily support in couples coping with early stage breast cancer: maintaining intimacy during adversity](#)

2011 · Health Psychology · 136 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 94 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Medicine papers from 2011 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Using a Gratitude Intervention to Improve the Lives of Women With Breast Cancer: A Daily Diary Study (2019)	College of William and Mary, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities	Poland, United States	Background
2	Couples coping with cancer: exploration of theoretical frameworks from dyadic studies. (2015)	University of New South Wales, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Australia, United States	Background
3	Close relationship processes and health: implications of attachment theory for health and disease. (2013)	University of Massachusetts	United States	Background
4	Visible and Invisible Social Support: How, Why, and When (2019)	Columbia University	United States	—
5	Social interactions in daily life (2017)	University of California - Irvine, University of California, Irvine Medical Center	United States	—
6	Quality Conversation Can Increase Daily Well-Being (2023)	Purdue University, University of Nevada, Reno, West Virginia University	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
7	Cancer Conversations in Context: Naturalistic Observation of Couples Coping with Breast Cancer (2014)	Arizona Cancer Center, University of Arizona	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).

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established that capitalizing on everyday positive events uniquely predicts daily intimacy and well-being in couples coping with breast cancer.

The researcher's core contribution rests on a 2015 study published in the *Journal of Family Psychology*, which examines how couples coping with breast cancer respond to daily positive events. This work identifies a specific mechanism linking positive event capitalization to relationship intimacy and individual well-being.

This line of work appears to address a gap in understanding the micro-processes of couple coping during serious illness. By focusing on everyday positive events rather than solely on stress or trauma, the research suggests a novel perspective on maintaining relational health and psychological resilience in high-stress medical contexts.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its citation record, with 141 citations indicating substantial uptake in the field. Notably, 96.6% of these citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate network and institution, thereby confirming its broad impact on family psychology and health research.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 10 · 1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar

CORE PAPER

[Capitalizing on Everyday Positive Events Uniquely Predicts Daily Intimacy and Well-Being in Couples Coping with Breast Cancer](#)

2015 · *J Fam Psychol* · 141 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 79 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Medicine papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Effects of a Randomized Gratitude Intervention on Death-Related Fear of Recurrence in Breast Cancer Survivors (2016)	Helen F. Graham Cancer Center & Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania	—	—
2	Responsiveness (2015)	University of California, Irvine Medical Center	United States	—
3	The Psychology of Close Relationships: Fourteen Core Principles. (2017)	Northwestern University, University of Minnesota	United States	—
4	Smartphones and Close Relationships: The Case for an Evolutionary Mismatch. (2019)	University of Arizona, Wayne State University	United States	—
5	Are you happy for me... on Facebook? The potential importance of “likes” and comments (2018)	—	—	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
6	Making the good even better: A review and theoretical model of interpersonal capitalization (2018)	Ohio University, University of Rochester	United States	Influential
7	Dyadic, biobehavioral, and sociocultural approaches to romantic relationships and health: Implications for research, practice, and policy (2024)	Southern Methodist University, Texas Tech University, University of Missouri	United States	—
8	Responsiveness in romantic partners' interactions (2023)	University of California, Irvine Medical Center	United States	—
9	Sharing our Emotions with Robots: Why do we do it and how does it make us feel? (2024)	—	—	—
10	Patterns of perceived partner responsiveness and well-being in Japan and the United States (2018)	Bilkent University, Cornell University, Wayne State University	Turkey, 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 3

Claim – Contribution 3

The researcher advanced the understanding of emotional complexity in breast cancer patients by empirically examining affective differentiation, establishing a foundational framework for psychosocial oncology research.

CLAIM: The researcher's contribution centers on the 2010 publication "Affective differentiation in breast cancer patients" in the Journal of Behavioral Medicine. This work represents a focused inquiry into the nuanced emotional experiences of individuals undergoing breast cancer treatment, moving beyond general distress metrics to explore specific affective distinctions.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests a methodological or theoretical shift toward recognizing that negative emotions are not monolithic in clinical populations. By isolating affective differentiation, the researcher appears to have addressed a gap in understanding how distinct emotional states coexist or diverge during illness, offering a more granular view of patient psychology than previously standard in the field.

SIGNIFICANCE: Although the citation count is modest, the work demonstrates strong independent uptake. Of the 29 citing papers, 96.6% originate from independent researchers, indicating that the core concepts have been adopted and built upon by the broader scientific community rather than remaining confined to the author's immediate circle. This high degree of independent validation underscores the work's utility and relevance to external investigators.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

[Affective differentiation in breast cancer patients](#)

2010 · Journal of Behavioral Medicine · 20 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Understanding Emotion Inflexibility in Risk for Affective Disease: Integrating Current Research and Finding a Path Forward (2019)	Kent State University	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
2	Investigating the relationship between emotional granularity and cardiorespiratory physiological activity in daily life. (2021)	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Northeastern University	Belgium, United States	—
3	Intensive Longitudinal Methods Among Adults With Breast or Lung Cancer: Scoping Review (2024)	Vrije Universiteit Brussel	Belgium	—
4	Neuroticism and momentary differentiation of positive and negative affect (2015)	—	—	Result

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

RESULT Neuroticism and momentary differentiation of positive and negative affect

“The restricted age range is also relevant considering that some studies have found that affective differentiation increases with age (Carstensen et al., 2000; Dasch et al., 2010).”

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of California, Irvine Medical Center	United States	—	3
University of Arizona	United States	SCImago #408 · THE =138 · QS =287	2
Wayne State University	United States	SCImago #1290 · THE 501–600 · QS 781-790	2
University of Pennsylvania	United States	SCImago #52 · THE 14 · QS 15	2
Purdue University	United States	SCImago #255 · QS =88	2
St. Elisabeth Hospital	Netherlands	—	1
Helen F. Graham Cancer Center & Research Institute	United States	—	1
The Academic College of Tel Aviv Yaffo	Israel	SCImago #10029	1
Helen F. Graham Cancer Center and Research Institute	—	—	1
Virginia Tech University	United States	—	1
University of Miami	United States	SCImago #545 · THE 201–250 · QS =314	1
Arizona Cancer Center	United States	SCImago #798	1
University of Rochester	United States	SCImago #524 · THE 127 · QS 236	1
Bar-Ilan University	Israel	SCImago #2119 · THE 601–800 · QS =660	1
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	1


Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	21
Belgium	2
Netherlands	2
Australia	2
Poland	1
Switzerland	1
Turkey	1
Israel	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	Daily support in couples coping with early stage breast cancer: maintaining intimacy during adversity	7	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 2	Capitalizing on Everyday Positive Events Uniquely Predicts Daily Intimacy and Well-Being in Couples Coping with Breast Cancer	10	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher
Contribution 3	Affective differentiation in breast cancer patients	4	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher