



ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Strong publication record clears criteria 5 and 6 outright. Three plausible criteria become strong with 2–4 weeks of targeted recommender and judging activity. Final filing is recommended within 4 months.

STRATEGY Evidence Strategy

FOCUS	#5 Original Contributions of Major Significance	#6 Authorship of Scholarly Articles	
STRENGTH-EN	#1 Awards for Excellence	#2 Membership Requiring Outstanding Achievement	#8 Leading or Critical Role
SKIP	#7	#9	#10

File on original contributions (#5) and scholarly articles (#6) as anchors. Strengthen awards (#1), membership (#2), and leading role (#8) to cross the 3-criteria threshold with margin. Judging (#4) is the fastest fix — 2 weeks to get on a reviewer list.

OVERVIEW 10 Criteria Scoreboard

#	CRITERION	STATUS
1	Awards for Excellence	PLAUSIBLE
2	Membership Requiring Outstanding Achievement	PLAUSIBLE
3	Published Material About You	PLAUSIBLE
4	Judge of the Work of Others	MISSING
5	Original Contributions of Major Significance	STRONG
6	Authorship of Scholarly Articles	STRONG
7	Display of Work at Artistic Exhibitions	MISSING
8	Leading or Critical Role	PLAUSIBLE
9	High Salary Relative to Field	NOT RELEVANT
10	Commercial Success in Performing Arts	NOT RELEVANT

#1 **Awards for Excellence**

PLAUSIBLE

EVIDENCE

ASHG Charles J. Epstein Trainee Award for best postdoctoral paper (2024). Department-level teaching excellence award (2023).

ANALYSIS **FULL REPORT**

The ASHG award is field-level and competitive (< 5% acceptance among 200+ submissions). USCIS adjudicators look for nationally or internationally recognized prizes. The ASHG award qualifies, but needs a supporting letter from the ASHG awards committee chair documenting selectivity criteria and applicant pool size.

AAO ADJUDICATOR ATTENTION

Attention: MODERATE Not Met: 312/847 (36.8%)

insufficient scope no selectivity evidence local not national

MATERIALS TO PREPARE **FULL REPORT**

Obtain ASHG award certificate, committee chair letter with selectivity data, and screenshots of official ASHG announcement.

#2 **Membership Requiring Outstanding Achievement**

PLAUSIBLE

EVIDENCE

Full member of the American Society of Human Genetics (ASHG). Member since 2022.

ANALYSIS **FULL REPORT**

ASHG membership requires a doctoral degree and active research in human genetics, but is not as selective as societies requiring nomination (e.g., NAS). To strengthen this criterion, document the membership requirements and rejection rate. If ASHG publishes acceptance statistics, include them.

AAO ADJUDICATOR ATTENTION

Attention: MODERATE Not Met: 201/523 (38.4%)

membership not selective no outstanding achievement required

MATERIALS TO PREPARE **FULL REPORT**

Request ASHG membership criteria documentation. If available, obtain data on application vs. acceptance rates.

#3 **Published Material About You**

PLAUSIBLE

EVIDENCE

No major press coverage found. One podcast interview on statistical genetics methods (2024). Referenced in a Stanford Medicine newsletter about polygenic risk scores.

ANALYSIS **FULL REPORT**

Published material must be about you specifically (not just citing your work). The podcast counts if the host attributed your contribution by name. The newsletter mention is borderline — needs to focus on your role, not just the lab. Look for any departmental profiles, university press releases, or field-specific blog coverage.

MATERIALS TO PREPARE [FULL REPORT](#)

Compile podcast transcript with timestamps of name mentions. Request Stanford Medicine communications office for any press releases featuring your work.

#4 Judge of the Work of Others

MISSING

EVIDENCE

No peer review activity found on CV.

ANALYSIS [FULL REPORT](#)

This is the most actionable gap. Getting on 1–2 journal reviewer lists typically takes 2–4 weeks with a PI referral. Target journals where your expertise is directly relevant: Bioinformatics, American Journal of Human Genetics. Ad-hoc reviews count. Conference abstract reviewing also qualifies if the conference has an independent program committee.

AAO ADJUDICATOR ATTENTION

Attention: STANDARD Not Met: 178/689 (25.8%)

insufficient volume

internal review only

MATERIALS TO PREPARE [FULL REPORT](#)

Email your PI for reviewer referral at Bioinformatics and AJHG. Keep all reviewer invitation emails and completed review confirmations.

#5 Original Contributions of Major Significance

STRONG

EVIDENCE

2024 PNAS paper on polygenic risk score calibration: 47 independent citations in 8 months, 12 documented field adoptions by other labs. Method integrated into UK Biobank analysis pipeline.

ANALYSIS [FULL REPORT](#)

This is your strongest criterion. The citation velocity and independent adoption pattern clearly demonstrate major significance. The UK Biobank integration is particularly compelling — it shows the field changed because of your work. Focus the petition narrative here. Collect adoption letters from at least 2 labs using your method.

AAO ADJUDICATOR ATTENTION

Attention: CRITICAL Not Met: 487/1102 (44.2%)

no independent adoption

citations insufficient

incremental not major

MATERIALS TO PREPARE [FULL REPORT](#)

Compile citation analysis showing independent (non-self) citations. Obtain letters from 2+ labs documenting how they adopted your method. Screenshot UK Biobank pipeline documentation referencing your work.

#6 Authorship of Scholarly Articles

STRONG

EVIDENCE

18 peer-reviewed publications. 8 first-author papers in journals including PNAS, AJHG, and Bioinformatics. h-index: 14. Total citations: 1,243.

ANALYSIS [FULL REPORT](#)

Publication record is well above the postdoc-stage average for this field. First-author ratio (44%) demonstrates intellectual leadership. Journal quality is consistently high-tier. The h-index of 14 at the postdoc stage places you in the top quartile for statistical genetics researchers at this career point.

AAO ADJUDICATOR ATTENTION

Attention: STANDARD **Not Met:** 198/1340 (14.8%)

coauthor not lead

journal quality questioned

MATERIALS TO PREPARE [FULL REPORT](#)

Generate Google Scholar or Scopus profile printout with citation metrics. Prepare journal impact factor table for each publication venue.

#7 Display of Work at Artistic Exhibitions

MISSING

EVIDENCE

Three poster presentations at ASHG Annual Meeting (2022–2024). No invited talks or oral presentations listed.

ANALYSIS [FULL REPORT](#)

Poster presentations alone are generally insufficient for this criterion, which historically applies more to arts and creative fields. However, if you have given any invited seminars at other institutions (even informal department talks), these may count. Conference oral presentations selected through competitive review are stronger.

MATERIALS TO PREPARE [FULL REPORT](#)

List any invited talks, department seminars, or competitively selected oral presentations not on CV.

#8 Leading or Critical Role

PLAUSIBLE

EVIDENCE

Postdoctoral researcher at Stanford Department of Genetics. Lead analyst on NIH R01-funded project (PI: Dr. [redacted]). Mentors 2 rotation students.

ANALYSIS [FULL REPORT](#)

Postdoc roles can qualify if you demonstrate critical and independent leadership within the research group. The key is showing the project would not succeed without your specific contributions. A strong PI letter explicitly stating your irreplaceable role is essential. Mentorship of students adds weight.

AAO ADJUDICATOR ATTENTION

Attention: MODERATE **Not Met:** 298/756 (39.4%)

role not critical

organization not distinguished

subordinate position

MATERIALS TO PREPARE [FULL REPORT](#)

Obtain PI letter emphasizing your critical role and independent contributions. Document student mentorship with specific outcomes. Include grant page showing your name and role.

#9 High Salary Relative to Field

NOT RELEVANT

EVIDENCE

Postdoctoral salary within standard NIH NRSA scale.

ANALYSIS FULL REPORT

Postdoctoral salaries are typically standardized and not competitive with industry. This criterion is not viable for most academic researchers at this career stage.

#10 Commercial Success in Performing Arts

NOT RELEVANT

EVIDENCE

Not applicable to research field.

ANALYSIS FULL REPORT

This criterion applies to performing arts and is not relevant to scientific research.

ADJUDICATION Two-Step Adjudication Framework

Under the Kazarian two-step framework, you need at least 3 criteria at Step 1. Currently 2 are strong and 4 are plausible. Strengthening awards (#1) and membership (#2) with supporting documentation, plus adding judging activity (#4), would give you 5 qualifying criteria — a comfortable margin. At Step 2, the sustained significance of your contributions (particularly the PNAS method adoption) and the trajectory of your citation record form a strong totality-of-evidence argument.

892

Total AAO Appeals

179

Sustained

312

Remanded

401

Dismissed

AAO appeal data reflects contested cases only and skews toward denials. Approval rates at the initial filing stage are significantly higher.

ACTIONS Action Plan Checklist

HIGH PRIORITY

- Get on 1–2 journal reviewer lists (Bioinformatics, AJHG)
- Identify 4 independent recommenders (2 outside Stanford)
- Document field-adoption of your 2024 PNAS method
- Obtain ASHG award selectivity data from committee chair
- Obtain PI letter documenting your critical role

MEDIUM PRIORITY

- Request ASHG membership criteria documentation
 - Compile press/media mentions and podcast transcripts
 - Generate citation analysis report (Google Scholar/Scopus)
 - Draft personal statement v0
-

LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This report is generated by VisaCanvas, an AI-powered assessment tool. It does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon as a substitute for consultation with a licensed U.S. immigration attorney. VisaCanvas is not a law firm and does not provide legal representation. The assessment is based on the information provided and publicly available AAO appeal decision data. USCIS adjudication standards may change, and individual case outcomes depend on many factors not captured here. Always consult a qualified immigration attorney before filing any petition.