O-1A / EB-1A Evidence Dossier

Sample excerpt — prepared for **Dr. Elena M. Vasquez, PhD** (fictional sample profile) · Computational Biology · Petition type: O-1A

Executive snapshot

This dossier organizes a researcher's record against the regulatory criteria for extraordinary ability, maps every claim to a numbered exhibit, and grades the strength of each criterion on the evidence actually in hand — not on the petitioner's hopes. In this sample, **5 of 8 criteria grade Strong**, 2 grade Developable within one quarter, and 1 is honestly graded Not pursued, with the reasoning shown. A reviewing attorney receives the full exhibit index, source documents, and the gap plan in Sections 3–5.

Criteria matrix (excerpt)

Criterion	Evidence on file	Strength	Gap / next action
Nationally / internationally recognized awards	2 society best-paper awards; 1 national early-career prize	Strong	Add award criteria + jury composition pages (Ex. A3)
Membership in associations requiring outstanding achievement	Elected senior member, 2 professional societies	Strong	Include bylaws showing election standard
Published material about the petitioner	3 features in field press; 1 university spotlight	Moderate	Translate 1 non-English feature; add circulation data
Judging the work of others	Peer reviewer, 4 journals; 2 grant panels	Strong	Attach editor invitation letters (Ex. D2–D5)
Original contributions of major significance	Method adopted by 3 independent labs; cited in 2 clinical guidelines	Strong	Collect adoption letters with specifics, not praise
Scholarly articles in professional journals	14 peer-reviewed papers; 2 first-author in top-quartile journals	Strong	Add citation report + journal ranking evidence
Leading or critical role in distinguished organizations	Program lead, multi-site consortium	Developable	Org chart + letter defining 'critical' with metrics
High remuneration	Salary above field median; consulting income documented	Not pursued	Insufficient margin over benchmark; revisit at renewal

Grades reflect the documentary record only. 'Strong' means the exhibit set, as filed, addresses the regulatory language directly; it is not a prediction of adjudication.

Evidence inventory (excerpt)

Exhibit	Document	Source	Status
A1	Best Paper Award certificate, Int. Conf. on Computational Biology (2023)	Society records office	Verified
A3	Award selection criteria and jury roster	Society website, archived PDF	Requested
C2	"The Lab Rewriting Drug Discovery" — field magazine feature (2024)	Publisher archive	Verified
D2–D5	Peer-review invitation letters, 4 journals (2022–2025)	Editorial systems	Verified
E1	Independent adoption letter — university medical center lab director	Signed letter on file	Verified

Exhibit	Document	Source	Status
F1	Citation report, 14 papers, field-normalized percentile	Bibliometric database export	Verified

One criterion in full — Original contributions of major significance

The regulatory test has two halves: the contribution must be **original**, and it must be of **major significance** to the field as a whole — not merely useful to the petitioner's own employer. Citation counts alone do not carry this criterion; documented uptake by independent parties does. The full dossier argues every claimed criterion at this depth. This sample shows the complete treatment for one.

The contribution. In 2021 the petitioner published an open analysis method for single-cell signaling data (Ex. E0). Since publication: three independent laboratories have adopted it as their standard pipeline (Ex. E1–E3); it is referenced in two clinical-practice guidelines (Ex. E4); and the petitioner has been invited to teach it at four methods workshops (Ex. E5).

Element to prove	Exhibit	What it establishes
Originality	E0 — method paper + code repository, dated release history	The method did not exist in this form before the petitioner's publication
Independent uptake	E1–E3 — adoption letters from 3 unaffiliated lab directors	Significance attested by parties with no stake in the petition
Field-level recognition	E4 — 2 clinical-practice guidelines citing the method	The contribution reached the field's standard-setting documents
Sustained demand	E5 — 4 invited methods-workshop programs (2022–2025)	Peers repeatedly sought the petitioner out to teach the contribution

The adjudicator's likely objection — and the answer

Objection: '*The exhibits show the work is used; use is not the same as major significance.*' Answer, as drafted in the full dossier: the adoption letters do not say the method is convenient — each director states a result their laboratory could not previously obtain, and the guideline citations place the method inside the documents that govern practice beyond any single laboratory. One residual gap is flagged honestly: a fourth adoption letter, from a European institute, is promised but not yet signed; the strengthening plan below carries its deadline, and the criterion is argued on the three letters in hand, not the four hoped for.

90-day strengthening plan (excerpt)

- **Days 1–30:** Close the two 'Requested' exhibits; commission certified translation of the non-English press feature.
- **Days 31–60:** Obtain the consortium org chart and a critical-role letter that quantifies the program's budget and headcount.
- **Days 61–90:** Final exhibit audit against the criteria matrix; attorney review copy with every claim cross-referenced to an exhibit number.

What the full DossierIQ deliverable contains

Section	Contents
1. Executive snapshot	Readiness grade, criteria scoreboard, and the honest bottom line on one page
2. Criteria matrix	All 8 O-1A criteria (or 10 EB-1A) graded against the evidence actually on file
3. Criterion deep-dives	The full argument for each claimed criterion, in the form shown in this sample
4. Evidence inventory	Every exhibit numbered, sourced, and marked verified / requested / missing

Section	Contents
5. Gap analysis	Exhibit-by-exhibit: what is weak, why it matters, what closes it
6. Strengthening plan	30 / 60 / 90-day actions with owners and deadlines
7. Attorney summary	Petition-organization summary written for the reviewing attorney

Methodology: every statement in the matrix traces to a document in the inventory; anything not documented is graded as a gap, never asserted. DossierIQ is an evidence-organization service, not a law firm, and this sample's fictional profile illustrates format only. Price: $249, one time.