U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 43242588

Date: JUN. 22, 2026

Appeal of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (Extraordinary Ability)

The Petitioner, a journalist, seeks classification under the employment-based, first-preference (EB-1) immigrant visa category as an alien with "extraordinary ability." *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(1)(A), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). This EB-1 classification makes immigrant visas available to those who can demonstrate their extraordinary ability through sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in their field through extensive documentation. Section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act.

USCIS denied the petition, concluding that the record did not establish, as required, that the Petitioner meets at least three of the ten initial evidentiary criteria for this classification. The matter is now before us on appeal pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). Upon de novo review, we will dismiss the appeal.

I. LAW

To qualify for this immigrant visa category, a petitioner must demonstrate that they:

- Have "extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics;"
- Seek to continue work in their field of expertise in the United States; and
- Would substantially benefit the United States as an immigrant.

Section 203(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iii) of the Act.

The term "extraordinary ability" means expertise commensurate with "one that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2). Unless a petitioner can demonstrate international recognition of his or her achievements in the field through a one-time achievement (that is, a major, internationally recognized award), they must provide sufficient qualifying documentation that meets at least three of the ten lesser evidentiary criteria listed at 8 C.F.R.

§ 204.5(h)(3)(i)–(x). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(4) allows a petitioner to submit comparable evidence if they are able to demonstrate that the standards at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)–(x) do not readily apply to the individual's occupation.

If a petitioner meets these initial evidence requirements, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) must then consider the totality of the material provided in a final merits determination and assess whether the record shows sustained national or international acclaim and demonstrates that the individual is among the small percentage at the very top of the field of endeavor. *See Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010) (discussing a two-part review where the documentation is first counted and then, if fulfilling the required number of criteria, considered in the context of a final merits determination); *see also Amin v. Mayorkas*, 24 F.4th 383, 391 (5th Cir. 2022) (finding USCIS' two-step extraordinary ability analysis "consistent with the governing statute and regulation"); *see generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B), www.uscis.gov/policy-manual.

II. ANALYSIS

The Petitioner seeks classification as an alien of extraordinary ability as a journalist. The Petitioner states that she earned a bachelor's degree in social communication with a specialization in journalism (2007) and a postgraduate degree in digital marketing, innovation and strategy (2021), in Brazil.[1] She states that she has 19 years of experience in broadcast, print and digital journalism, and is "one of Brazil's most respected and decorated journalists." The Petitioner has worked as a reporter, anchor and editor for major television networks in Brazil, and has reported on cases of national significance in her home country and the United States.

A. Evidentiary Criteria

Because the Petitioner has not indicated or shown that she received a major, internationally recognized award, she must satisfy at least three of the alternate regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)-(x). The Petitioner claimed to have satisfied eight of these criteria, summarized below:

- (i), Receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor;
- (iii), Published materials in major trade or professional publications or other major media;
- (iv), Participating as a judge of the work of others in the field;
- (v), Original contributions of major significance;
- (vi), Authorship of scholarly articles in the field, in professional or major trade publications or other major media;
- (vii), Display of work in the field at artistic exhibitions or showcases;
- (viii), Performing in leading or critical roles for organizations or establishments with a distinguished reputation, and;
- (ix), Commanding a high salary, or other significantly high remuneration for services.

[1] The record includes a copy of a "Titulo de Bacharel" in social communication issued to the Petitioner in 2007 by the [redacted] in Brazil. However, the record does not include academic transcripts detailing the number of years of study, the coursework, or specialization in journalism. Nor does the record include a postgraduate degree issued to the Petitioner.

Following review of the record, including evidence submitted in response to a request for evidence (RFE), SCOPS concluded that the Petitioner did not meet any of the claimed criteria 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3). SCOPS declined to conduct a final merits analysis. *See Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119-20. On appeal, the Petitioner refers to previously submitted documents in the record and reasserts that she meets six evidentiary criteria discussed in the decision.[2]

Upon de novo review, we conclude that the Petitioner does not meet at least three criteria and she is not eligible for the extraordinary ability visa classification sought, as discussed below.

1. Nationally or Internationally Recognized Prizes or Awards

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i) requires "[d]ocumentation of the alien's receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor." Relevant considerations regarding whether the basis for granting the prizes or awards was excellence in the field include: (1) the criteria used to grant the awards or prizes, (2) the national or international significance of the awards or prizes in the field, (3) the number of awardees or prize recipients, and (4) limitations on competitors. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra,* at F.2(B)(1).

The Petitioner initially presented six awards to claim that she satisfied this criterion:

- [redacted] (2014, 2015);
- [redacted] (2015);
- [redacted] (2022);
- [redacted] (2014);
- [redacted] (2023), and;
- [redacted] (2023).

In the RFE, SCOPS noted that the record did not include evidence that the Petitioner had received any award, other than the [redacted] SCOPS further noted that the record did not include sufficient documentary evidence about any of the awards to determine whether they are nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards satisfying all elements of this criterion.

In response to the RFE, the Petitioner asserted that the following awards meet the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i), and submitted additional evidence:

- [redacted] (2014, 2015);
- [redacted] (2015);
- [redacted] (2022), and;
- [redacted] (2023).

[2] As the Petitioner does not contend on appeal that she meets the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv) and (vii), we deem them waived.

After reviewing the additional evidence, SCOPS determined that the record continued to lack evidence that the Petitioner received the [redacted] (2014), the [redacted] (2015), and the [redacted] (2022). SCOPS further determined that the information about the awards was in a foreign language and not accompanied by a full English translation.[3] Without proper translations, SCOPS stated that it was precluded from determining whether the awards satisfy all elements of this criterion.

On appeal, the Petitioner submits new English translations of evidence in the record and asserts that four of the original six claimed awards satisfy this criterion:

- [redacted] (2015);
- [redacted] (2015);
- [redacted] (2022), and;
- [redacted] (2023).

Upon review of the complete record, we conclude that the record does not include evidence that the Petitioner was awarded the [redacted] (2014), the [redacted] (2015), or the [redacted] (2022). Further, although the record includes a copy of the [redacted] awarded to the Petitioner by the city council of [redacted] in 2023, the record lacks documentary evidence about this award, including the criteria used to grant the award, the national or international significance of the award, the number of awardees or any limitations on competitors. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1).

Concerning the [redacted] which she initially claimed receipt of in 2014 and 2015, the record includes a declaration from the president of [redacted] the awarding organization, attesting to the Petitioner's receipt of this award in 2015 in the television journalism category for "the series of reports [redacted]." The declaration does not mention any award given to the Petitioner in 2014. The record includes "regulations" for the 2012 and 2013-2014 [redacted] awards. However, the record lacks documentary evidence about the 2015 criteria for conferring the award. Therefore, we are precluded from determining whether this award is nationally or internationally recognized and satisfies all elements of this criterion.

For the reasons discussed above, the Petitioner has not established that she meets this criterion.

2. Published Material About the Petitioner

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii) requires "[p]ublished material about the alien in professional or major trade publications or other major media, relating to the alien's work in the field for which classification is sought." These materials must include "the title, date, and author of the material, and any necessary translation." *Id.* The person and the person's work need not be the only subject of the material; published material that covers a broader topic but includes a substantial

[3] Any document containing foreign language submitted to USCIS shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3).

discussion of the person's work in the field and mentions the person in connection to the work may be considered material about the person relating to the person's work. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1).

The Petitioner initially claimed to meet this criterion based on "media coverage of her awards and professional milestones in major outlets," including in newspapers *Diario de Pernambuco* and *Jornal do Commercio*, and other "digital platforms." The Petitioner submitted copies of articles and English translations.

In the RFE, SCOPS noted that some of the articles were incomplete and/or illegible, and that the articles did not include the date and author, as required by the plain language of C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii). SCOPS further noted that the record did not include evidence, such as circulation statistics, demonstrating that the articles were published in professional or major trade publications or other major media.

In response to the RFE, the Petitioner provided "better copies of the articles submitted in the original application." The Petitioner also submitted information about *Jornal do Commercio*, including a *Wikipedia* entry, to claim that it is major media. Additionally, the Petitioner asserted that it is "standard editorial practice" for articles to be published without an individual byline or author name.

After reviewing the additional evidence, SCOPS determined that the Petitioner's response continued to include incomplete or illegible copies and did not include the date and author for each publication as required by the regulation. SCOPS noted that the Petitioner provided information about only one publication, *Jornal do Commercio*, but declined to consider the *Wikipedia* entry as probative.[4] SCOPS concluded that the Petitioner did not establish that the material about the Petitioner was published in professional publications, major trade publications, or in major media.

On appeal, the Petitioner does not provide additional published material but disagrees with SCOPS' conclusion. The Petitioner references five publications that she states establish her eligibility under this criterion, including three articles in *Jornal do Commercio*, one article in *TV Novelas Magazine*, and an interview broadcast on the radio station *CBN Recife* and advertised on its blog. She references the *Wikipedia* article as "objective, independently verifiable data" regarding circulation data for *Jornal do Commercio* and provides an additional *Wikipedia* entry for *CBN Recife*.

---

[4] Online content from *Wikipedia* is subject to the following general disclaimer:

> WIKIPEDIA MAKES NO GUARANTEE OF VALIDITY. *Wikipedia* is an online open-content collaborative encyclopedia, that is, a voluntary association of individuals and groups working to develop a common resource of human knowledge. The structure of the project allows anyone with an Internet connection to alter its content. Please be advised that nothing found here has necessarily been reviewed by people with the expertise required to provide you with complete, accurate or reliable information. . . . *Wikipedia* cannot guarantee the validity of the information found here. The content of any given article may recently have been changed, vandalized or altered by someone whose opinion does not correspond with the state of knowledge in the relevant fields.

Wikipedia: *General disclaimer*, Wikipedia (Jun. 4, 2026), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:General_disclaimer.

The record does not include a transcript of the *CBN Recife* interview or provide other information about its content beyond the brief introduction published on the blog. Therefore, we are precluded from determining whether this material is about the Petitioner and meets the plain language of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iii). Further, the Petitioner does not submit any background information on *TV Novelas Magazine* to demonstrate that it is a professional or major trade publication or other major media.

With regard to the publications in *Jornal do Commercio*, the Petitioner has not established that this is a professional or major trade publication or other major media. Because any internet user can edit *Wikipedia* entries, the site's information is unreliable. *See Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526-27 (BIA 2015)(noting that "*Wikipedia* articles lack indicia of reliability and warrant very little probative weight in immigration proceedings"); *see also Badasa v. Mukasey,* 540 F.3d 909, 910 (8th Cir. 2008). We acknowledge that the record includes a letter from the director of journalism of *Jornal do Commercio* verifying that it is "a nationally recognized media outlet" and attesting to the authenticity of the articles about the Petitioner and its editorial practice to omit bylines. However, contrary to USCIS policy, neither the letter nor the *Wikipedia* information provides the circulation, readership, or viewership of the publication or compares the data to other major media to establish that it would be a professional or major trade publication or other major media. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1).

Because the Petitioner's documentary evidence does not sufficiently reflect published material about her relating to her work in professional or major trade publications or other major media, she does not meet this criterion.

3. Judge of the Work of Others

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv) requires "[e]vidence of the alien's participation, either individually or on a panel, as a judge of the work of others in the same or an allied field of specification for which classification is sought." The Petitioner initially claimed that she met this criterion based on her position as editor-in-chief and content coordinator, evaluating and supervising journalistic work. However, the Petitioner provided no additional evidence in response to SCOPS' RFE and SCOPS concluded that she did not establish that she met this criterion.

On appeal, the Petitioner does not contest SCOPS' decision that the Petitioner did not meet this criterion. Any ground of ineligibility that is not raised on appeal is waived. *See Matter of O-R-E-*, 28 I&N Dec. 330, 336 n.5 (BIA 2021) (citing *Matter of R-A-M-*, 25 I&N Dec. 657, 658 n.2 (BIA 2012)).

4. Original Contributions

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(v) requires "[e]vidence of the alien's original scientific, scholarly, artistic, athletic, or business-related contributions of major significance in the field." Analysis under this criterion focuses on whether the person's original work constitutes major, significant contributions to the field. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1). Evidence that the person's work was funded, patented, or published, while potentially demonstrating the work's originality, will not necessarily establish, on its own, that the work is of major significance to the field. *Id.* For example, published research that has provoked widespread commentary on its importance from others working in the field, and documentation that it has been highly cited relative

to others' work in the field, may be probative of the significance of the person's contributions to the field of endeavor. *Id.*

The Petitioner claims to meet this criterion based on an original methodology of community-embedded investigative journalism she developed "throughout her career in Brazil's highest-level media institutions." SCOPS stated in the RFE that the Petitioner did not submit documentary evidence to support her claim that her contribution is original or of significance to the field.

In response to the RFE, the Petitioner submitted evidence in the form of *Wikipedia* entries about the media institutions with which she has worked. The Petitioner also referenced expert opinion and support letters in the record that address "the originality and significance of [the Petitioner's] methodology."

SCOPS again declined to consider the information from *Wikipedia*. SCOPS also determined that the expert opinion letters, while supportive of the petition, did not provide a detailed explanation of how the Petitioner's contributions relate to the field of journalism, including whether her contributions are original and of major significance to the field as a whole.

On appeal, the Petitioner references evidence already in the record and disagrees with SCOPS' conclusion. She states that her original approach is "reporting from within affected communities rather than from institutional sources, building trust with populations that traditionally distrust media, and translating complex governmental and legal failures into accessible public information that drives accountability."

The recommendation and support letters discuss the Petitioner's personal and professional attributes, as well as her professional achievements.[5] A letter from [redacted], a journalist and the Petitioner's former colleague, praises the Petitioner's professional qualities and achievements. A letter from journalist [redacted] states that the Petitioner is a professional who represents "strengthening journalistic integrity, institutional transparency, and intercultural dialogue." A letter from [redacted], vice president of a non-profit organization, discusses the Petitioner's volunteer work on a community event which helped the community "by improving access to reliable information and facilitating constructive dialogue" while helping "counter misinformation, reduce conflict, and promote informed civic participation." However, the letters do not mention the Petitioner's "original methodology of community-embedded investigative journalism" or its significance to the field of journalism.

The Petitioner also references a "technical opinion" and "behavioral profile analysis applied to the entrepreneurship context." However, this report is a psychological report of the Petitioner's personality using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and includes no discussion of the Petitioner's professional journalistic achievements or her original contributions.

While the letters demonstrate the Petitioner's experience in journalism, the letters do not sufficiently establish that her contributions are "of major significance in the field." The phrase "major significance" is not superfluous and, thus, it has some meaning. *Silverman v. Eastrich Multiple*

[5] Although we discuss a sampling of letters, we have reviewed and considered each one.

Investor Fund, L.P., 51 F. 3d 28, 31 (3rd Cir. 1995) *quoted in APWU v. Potter*, 343 F.3d 619, 626 (2nd Cir. 2003). The letters do not discuss the Petitioner's original contributions, but rather her qualities as a journalist. In this case, without information and evidence corroborating the claimed significance the Petitioner asserts, the record does not sufficiently show that the Petitioner's claimed original contributions are of major significance to the field of journalism.

The Petitioner references four journalistic endeavors to which she asserts that she applied her original methodology. These include an investigative series on urban mobility and infrastructure, a series on domestic and community violence, coverage of the COVID-19 pandemic, and a program highlighting immigrant stories. However, examples of the Petitioner's work are not sufficient evidence under 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(v) absent evidence that they were of "major significance." *Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1036. In 2010, the *Kazarian* court reaffirmed its holding that we did not abuse our discretion in finding that the alien had not demonstrated contributions of major significance. *Id.* at 1122. Although some of the support letters mention the Petitioner's works, they do not discuss the nature and significance of these works to the field. Detailed letters from experts in the field explaining the nature and significance of the person's contributions may provide valuable context for evaluating the claimed original contributions of major significance, particularly when the record includes documentation corroborating the claimed significance. 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1).

Here, the record lacks evidence of the significance of the Petitioner's reporting and methodology to the field of journalism. The Petitioner has not submitted evidence that her publications have provoked widespread commentary on their importance, or have been highly referenced or used relative to others' work in the field. *See generally id.* For the reasons discussed above, the Petitioner has not established that she meets this criterion.

5. Authorship of Scholarly Articles

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vi) calls for "evidence of the alien's authorship of scholarly articles in the field, in professional or major trade publications or other major media." SCOPS concluded that the Petitioner did not provide evidence regarding this criterion. On appeal, the Petitioner asserts that SCOPS "ignores the employment records, expert letters, and published materials in the record that collectively establish [the Petitioner's] authorship of journalistic works in major media."

A scholarly article should be written for "learned" persons in the field. "Learned" is defined as having or demonstrating profound knowledge or scholarship. Learned persons include all persons having profound knowledge of a field. 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1). Here, the Petitioner has not established that her journalistic works in major media were for "learned" persons, rather than for the general population. Moreover, she has not shown that her works were peer reviewed by other experts in journalism or contain other characteristics of scholarly articles. *Id.* (indicating that scholarly articles "should have footnotes, endnotes, or a bibliography"). The Petitioner therefore has not established that she satisfies this criterion.

6. Display at Artistic Exhibitions

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(vii) requires "[e]vidence of the display of the alien's work in the field at artistic exhibitions or showcases." To meet this criterion, the Petitioner must first show that the work that was displayed is her work product. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1). Second, the venues, whether they are virtual or otherwise, where the Petitioner's work was displayed must be artistic exhibitions or showcases. *Id.* The *USCIS Policy Manual* interprets "exhibition" as a public showing as of works of art, objects of manufacture, or athletic skill. *Id.* The plain language of the criterion includes the modifier "artistic" and explicitly requires that the exhibitions or showcases be "artistic" in nature. *Id.* We only consider non-artistic exhibitions or showcases as part of a properly supported claim of comparable evidence. *Id.* For instance, a scientific researcher who displays his work at a conference, symposium, workshop, or meeting would not meet the requirements of this criterion. *See Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d at 1122 (finding that self-publishing a textbook, lecturing at a community college, and presenting at conferences were not displays at artistic exhibitions or showcases consistent with the relevant regulatory language).

The Petitioner initially claimed that she met this criterion based on "her productions [that] have been broadcast nationally, showcased at public award ceremonies, and honored in legislative sessions." However, the Petitioner provided no additional evidence in response to SCOPS' RFE and SCOPS concluded that she did not establish that she met this criterion.

On appeal, the Petitioner does not contest SCOPS' decision that she did not meet this criterion. Any ground of ineligibility that is not raised on appeal is waived. *See Matter of O-R-E-*, 28 I&N Dec. 330, 336 n.5.

7. Performed in a Leading or Critical Role

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(viii) requires "[e]vidence that the alien has performed in a leading or critical role for organizations or establishments that have a distinguished reputation."

The Petitioner stated that her "career includes leading and critical roles at some of Brazil's most prominent and influential news organizations, including [redacted] She submitted recommendation and support letters in an attempt to describe her role, and printouts of *Wikipedia* entries in an attempt to demonstrate the reputation of each organization.

SCOPS concluded that the Petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that her role with any organization was leading or critical. SCOPS declined to consider the information from *Wikipedia* and further concluded that the Petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that any of the organizations have a distinguished reputation.

On appeal, the Petitioner does not submit new evidence but again references the recommendation letters and *Wikipedia* entries. She states that SCOPS erred in ignoring the evidence in the record.

If a leading role, the evidence (including, but not limited to, a title with appropriate matching duties) must establish that the alien is (or was) a leader. 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1). If a critical role, the evidence must establish that the alien has contributed in a way that is of significant importance to the outcome of the organization or establishment's activities. *Id.*

SCOPS noted that the recommendation letters in the record do not detail the dates of the Petitioner's service to any organization, her specific responsibilities, or her individual importance to their overall success. We agree.

At the outset, we note that only one letter in the record appears to be from the Petitioner's employer. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(1) states, "Evidence relating to qualifying experience or training shall be in the form of letter(s) from current or former employer(s) or trainer(s) and shall include the name, address, and title of the writer, and a specific description of the duties performed by the alien or of the training received." *See also* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1) ("Evidence of experience must consist of letters from employers."). While some of the recommendation letters in the record appear to be from the Petitioner's former colleagues, only the letter from her current employer, [redacted] meets the regulatory criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(1).

The letter from [redacted] states that the Petitioner has been its international correspondent since February 1, 2023. The letter does not provide a specific description of the Petitioner's duties or describe her role as leading or critical. The letter states, "Among her main responsibilities, she is responsible for creating, presenting and hosting the program [redacted] an original journalistic product of [redacted] broadcast continuously on our digital channels, social networks, and YouTube, in addition to featuring segments and related content also transmitted by [redacted] The letter does not list other responsibilities of international correspondent. Nor does the record include other evidence to establish that [redacted] has a distinguished reputation.

The letter from the Petitioner's colleague, [redacted], gives a general description of the Petitioner's role with multiple organizations. However, it does not provide a detailed list of job duties or an explanation of how the Petitioner's role for any organization was leading or critical. For example, [redacted] describes the Petitioner's role as content coordinator for [redacted] as "leading teams from ten affiliates and coordinating strategic deliverables for the national network." He highlights the Petitioner's professional qualities generally, but does not provide specific job titles or job duties for other roles with other organizations. Nor does he explain the importance of those roles. For example, he states, "Her experience at [redacted] an affiliate of [redacted] also carries significant weight." He then goes on to discuss [redacted] as an organization, but does not give further details about the Petitioner's job title or duties, or explain why her experience was significant.

Additional letters from the Petitioner's colleagues and acquaintances, including [redacted] praise the Petitioner's work as a journalist and her professional proficiency but do not describe any specific role for any specific organization.

Further, the Petitioner has not provided additional information beyond *Wikipedia* entries to establish that any of the organizations she lists has a distinguished reputation. As noted above, because any

internet user can edit *Wikipedia* entries, the site's information is unreliable. *See Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526-27; *see also Badasa v. Mukasey,* 540 F.3d 909, 910.

The Petitioner has not established that she satisfies the requirements of this criterion.

8. Commanded a High Salary or Other Remuneration

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(ix) requires "[e]vidence that the alien has commanded a high salary or other significantly high remuneration for services, in relation to others in the field." To meet this criterion, the Petitioner must demonstrate that her salary or remuneration is high relative to the compensation paid to others in the field. To determine whether a person's compensation is high relative to others, USCIS will consider comparative evidence, such as geographical or position-appropriate compensation surveys. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1). Broad descriptions that include multiple occupations may not provide an accurate comparison to others in the field. *Id.*

The Petitioner did not initially claim that she satisfied this criterion. In response to the RFE, however, she submitted her 2019 individual income tax return and a printout from *optisalary.com*, titled "Journalist salary in Brazil," and showing average salary data for 2026. As SCOPS noted, the 2026 salary data is not probative of the Petitioner's 2019 income, and provides information about salaries in Brazil generally, without a more specific geographic location.

On appeal, the Petitioner references "comparative labor market data from [redacted] [to establish] the average annual compensation for journalists in the same region and profession." She states that SCOPS erred in ignoring this evidence. Although the Petitioner also referenced this evidence in her cover letter with the RFE response, it was not, in fact, included with that submission. Nor was it submitted on appeal.

Part of this criterion requires comparing petitioners to others in the field, which demands evidence regarding individuals with comparable roles. Without evidence of comparable data for the role of a journalist in the same year and geographic location, we do not have adequate information to determine whether the Petitioner meets this criterion. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual, supra*, at F.2(B)(1). It is the Petitioner's burden to establish eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. at 375-76. The Petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to establish this criterion.

B. Summary

Upon review of the record, we conclude that the Petitioner has not submitted the required initial evidence of either a one-time achievement or documents that meet at least three of the ten criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i)-(x). Thus, we need not fully address the totality of the materials in a final merits determination. *Kazarian*, 596 F.3d at 1119-20. Nevertheless, we have reviewed the record in the aggregate, and conclude that it does not support a finding that the Petitioner has established the level of expertise required for the classification sought.

Here, the Petitioner has not shown that the significance of her accomplishments as a journalist is indicative of the required sustained national or international acclaim or that it is consistent with a "career of acclaimed work in the field" as contemplated by Congress. H.R. Rep. No. 101-723, 59 (Sept. 19, 1990); *see also* section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act. Moreover, the record does not otherwise demonstrate that the Petitioner has garnered national or international acclaim in the field, and that she is one of the small percentage who has risen to the very top of the field of endeavor. *See* section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2).

III. CONCLUSION

The Petitioner has not shown that she qualifies for classification as an individual of extraordinary ability under section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act. The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons. In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Skirball Cultural Ctr.*, 25 I&N Dec. 799, 806 (AAO 2012). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

NOTICE: This constitutes the final decision in this matter. The filing of a motion will not postpone the effect of the decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(iv). Aliens who are not lawfully present, or who are otherwise inadmissible or deportable, may be subject to the commencement of removal proceedings under section 240 of the Act through the issuance of a Form I-862, Notice to Appear. Those proceedings may result in their removal from the United States and possible ineligibility for future visas or other immigration benefits.