visalaw.ai

O-1A / O-1B Evidence Mapping Prompt Guide

Prompts and workflow ideas for mapping evidence to the regulatory criteria, catching gaps and inconsistencies, and preparing filing-ready materials in Visalaw AI.

www.visalaw.ai

How to use this guide

Use these prompts inside a Visalaw AI project after uploading the relevant O-1 case documents. The prompts are designed to help your team move from document intake to structured evidence mapping, gap analysis, consistency review, and attorney-ready filing materials. They are not a substitute for legal judgment or final attorney review.

An O-1 petition is an argument built from evidence. O-1A requires satisfying at least three of eight regulatory criteria under 8 CFR 214.2(o)(3)(iii); O-1B is evaluated under its own distinct criteria for the arts or motion picture and television industry. Most RFEs trace back to the same handful of problems: criteria that look stronger in summary than in the underlying record, cross-document inconsistencies, and claims the evidence doesn't quite support. Catching these before filing is the highest-leverage moment in the whole matter.

Helpful Visalaw AI links: Platform overview | Blog and resources | Security and privacy | Book a demo

1. Recommended Workflow

- Create one project per matter: keep the case file, chats, prompt outputs, and draft work product together so anyone picking up the file later has the same context.
- Upload the evidence before you draft: include the petitioner and beneficiary agreements, CV or resume, award and membership documentation, press coverage, expert letters, salary and compensation records, prior approvals, and the itinerary.
- Start with organization, not conclusions: ask Visalaw AI to index and inventory the file before asking for criteria analysis. This gives the team a shared picture of the record before anyone forms a filing strategy.
- Map the evidence to the criteria: O-1A has eight possible criteria; you need three. O-1B has its own set. Get the map before you draft the letter.
- Flag the gaps while there's still time to fix them: the most valuable moment in the workflow is before filing, when a missing document can still be requested with one client email.
- Run a consistency check across the whole record: job titles, dates, citation counts, salary figures, and any expert who appears in more than one role are the errors that usually get caught too late, if at all.
- Pressure-test the record like an adjudicator would: ask where the evidence is thin, conclusory, or reliant on the employer alone, and what an RFE would most likely ask for.
- Convert the analysis into action: turn the gap list into an exhibit index, a letter outline, and an attorney review memo.
- Review before relying on it: treat every output as a structured first draft. The attorney decides which criteria to claim, reviews every letter, and signs off before anything is filed.

2. What to Upload for a Strong O-1 Analysis

The stronger and more complete the project file is, the better Visalaw AI can help identify defensible criteria, gaps, and drafting priorities. Typical inputs include:

- Petition support letter draft, employment agreement, offer letter, and itinerary (for agents or multiple engagements)
- CV or resume, and a categorized inventory of any prior USCIS approvals, extensions, or amendments
- Award documentation, nomination records, and any evidence of national or international recognition
- Membership records for professional associations, including admission criteria and bylaws where the org's selectivity is in question
- Press coverage, published material about the beneficiary, and citation records (distinguished from citations of the beneficiary's own work)
- Judging records: invitations, confirmations, panel rosters, or review records for any judging claim
- Expert and recommendation letters, including each expert's CV or bio and any other role that expert plays in the record
- Compensation evidence: offer letter, employment agreement, compensation summary, payroll records, and any wage or comparable-compensation analysis
- Draft Form I-129 and O supplement, attorney notes, document checklist, client correspondence, and any prior RFE, NOID, or denial

3. Prompt Library by Workflow Stage

Copy, paste, and adapt these prompts in Visalaw AI. Replace bracketed text with matter-specific facts where useful.

A. File Intake and Case Snapshot

Summarize this O-1 matter: who the beneficiary is, the petitioning employer, the role and start date, and a categorized inventory of every document uploaded. Note any prior USCIS approvals.

Use when: you are opening a new matter, inheriting a dormant file, or preparing an attorney handoff.

B. Criteria Mapping

Map the uploaded evidence to the eight O-1A regulatory criteria. For each criterion, list which specific documents support it, rate the strength (strong / moderate / weak / not met), and explain the reasoning. Flag any criterion where the evidence looks weaker than it first appears.

Use when: you need to know whether the file can support a filing before anyone drafts. For O-1B matters, substitute the applicable arts or motion picture/television criteria.

C. Gap and Weakness Analysis

Based on the criteria mapping, list the gaps and weaknesses in this petition. For each, explain why it's a problem and what additional evidence or correction would strengthen it before filing. Separate must-fix from would-help.

Use when: there's still time to request a document from the client before filing.

D. Consistency Check Across the Record

Check the entire document set for internal inconsistencies: job titles, dates, citation counts, salary figures, and any individual who appears in more than one role. List each inconsistency with the conflicting sources.

Use when: you are running a pre-filing quality-control pass, or the file came together over months.

E. Adjudicator Pressure Test

Pressure-test each criterion we plan to claim as an adjudicator would. Where is the evidence thin, conclusory, or reliant on the employer alone? What would an RFE most likely ask for?

Use when: the strategy is close to final and you want an adversarial read before committing to it.

F. Expert and Recommendation Letter Review

Review the expert letters for qualifications, independence, and criterion fit. Flag any letter that is vague, duplicative, or written by someone who also appears elsewhere in the record.

Use when: you have several letters and need to know which ones actually carry weight, and whether any expert's independence is compromised by a second role in the file.

G. Compensation Consistency Check

Confirm the salary figure is consistent across the offer letter, employment agreement, compensation summary, payroll stub, and wage or comparable-compensation analysis.

Use when: high remuneration is one of the claimed criteria, or compensation appears anywhere else in the record.

H. Itinerary and Status Continuity Check

Check the itinerary and prior approval against the new start date for status continuity.

Use when: the beneficiary has a prior O-1 approval, a gap in status, or multiple engagements requiring an itinerary.

I. Exhibit List and Letter Outline

Create a filing-ready exhibit list. Number each exhibit, give it a short descriptive title, and note which O-1 criterion or criteria it supports. Order exhibits by criterion, strongest first.

Draft an outline for the O-1 petition letter argument. For each criterion we're claiming, write the heading, the key facts, and the exhibits cited. Only include criteria supported by the evidence. Mark anything that still needs attorney review.

Use when: the strategy is set and it's time to move from analysis to drafting.

J. Attorney Review Memo

Draft a concise attorney review memo covering criteria status, the most serious record problems, the decisions only the attorney can make, and a recommended pre-filing sequence.

Use when: you are assembling the filing and preparing the attorney handoff.

4. Short Prompts to Keep Handy

1. Summarize this O-1 matter and index every document by evidence category. Note which documents are originals and which are summaries or excerpts.
2. Map the evidence to the O-1A regulatory criteria. Table format: criterion, supporting documents, strength, gaps.
3. Identify every place where a CV line or cover statement asserts something the underlying evidence does not support.

4. Check the entire document set for inconsistencies in titles, dates, citation counts, and salary figures.
5. Flag any membership claimed under the membership criterion that appears to be open to the public rather than selective.
6. Distinguish citations of the beneficiary's own work from published material about the beneficiary, and tell me which criterion each actually supports.
7. Pressure-test each criterion as an adjudicator would and tell me what an RFE would most likely request.
8. For each expert letter, tell me whether the author appears anywhere else in the record and whether that creates an independence question.
9. Confirm the salary figure is consistent across every document in the file that states it.
10. Create a filing-ready exhibit list ordered by criterion, strongest first.
11. Draft an attorney review memo with criteria status, the top record problems, and the decisions only the attorney can make.

5. Pre-Filing Adjudication Stress Test

This optional sequence helps your team pressure-test the file before filing. Use it as a risk-identification exercise, not as a prediction of what USCIS will do. Real adjudication varies by officer, facts, and evidence quality. Never share the mock decision with a client or describe it as a likelihood of approval.

Prompt 1: Mock Adjudicator Review

Act as a USCIS officer adjudicating this O-1 petition on the record as it exists today. Draft the Request for Evidence you would issue. Be critical. Address each criterion separately, cite the specific record weakness prompting each request, and state what additional evidence would resolve it. Do not soften the analysis.

Prompt 2: Remediation Table

Now act as the petitioner's legal team. Convert every deficiency in that RFE into a remediation table with five columns: the issue, the criterion affected, the evidence or revision that would cure it, who obtains it (attorney, paralegal, or client), and realistic timing. Separate items fixable with documents already in the file from items requiring new evidence. Rank by likely impact on the case.

Prompt 3: Re-Review After Fixes

Assume every item in the remediation table is completed and added to the file. Acting again as the reviewing officer, state which issues are now resolved, which remain open, and what residual risks the attorney should weigh before filing.

6. Common Pitfalls to Screen For

Pitfall	What to Check
Internal recognition claimed as a national or international award	A CV line about an "award-winning platform" or similar needs actual award evidence behind it. Internal recognition is not a nationally or internationally recognized award.

Pitfall	What to Check
Open-membership organizations claimed under the membership criterion	Organizations like IEEE or AAAI generally do not qualify unless membership requires outstanding achievement as judged by recognized experts. Check the bylaws, not the org's reputation.
Citations confused with published material about the beneficiary	People citing the beneficiary's article supports the authorship or original-contributions criterion, not the separate "published material about the beneficiary" criterion.
A judging claim resting on one unsupported CV line	A line like "reviewer for conference submissions" needs an invitation, confirmation, or review record behind it, not just an assertion.
Inconsistent job titles across documents	The same person titled differently in the employment agreement, support letter, and CV invites scrutiny of the rest of the record. Pick one primary title and use it everywhere.
The same expert in two roles	An expert who signs a recommendation letter and also appears elsewhere in the record (as a colleague, employer, or independent reviewer) invites an independence question from the adjudicator.
Duplicate publication entries inflating the CV	Cross-check the publication list against the actual citation record before it goes in the file.
Salary figures that don't match across documents	The offer letter, employment agreement, compensation summary, payroll stub, and wage analysis should all state the same figure.
Itinerary or status gap not addressed	Check the itinerary and any prior approval against the new start date for status continuity, especially where the beneficiary has multiple engagements or a gap in status.
The letter argues more than the evidence shows	If the support letter claims a criterion, the underlying exhibits need to actually carry it. Overclaiming invites scrutiny of every other criterion in the filing.

7. Prompting Best Practices in Visalaw AI

- Give the tool a role and objective: example: "Act as an immigration paralegal preparing an attorney review memo for an O-1A petition."
- Ask for organization before conclusions: the tool is most reliable when it is describing and comparing what is in front of it. Save strategy questions for after you have a clean picture of the record.
- Require the source: any prompt asking for a criteria map or consistency check should require the source document for each claim. It makes verification fast and conflicts visible.
- Use adverse review deliberately: asking the tool to argue against your own file, as an adjudicator would, produces more useful output than asking it to rate the file's strength.
- Don't let it draft around a gap: use it to identify what's missing, then get the real document or a client answer, rather than smoothing over a thin criterion in the letter.
- Use placeholders instead of invented facts: ask Visalaw AI to bracket missing details so the team can collect them from the client or employer.

- Preserve attorney judgment: use the output to accelerate review, not to replace supervision, legal strategy, or final editing.

8. Additional Resources

- Visalaw AI Platform Overview: learn more about Visalaw AI's immigration-focused research, analysis, drafting, and workflow capabilities.
- Visalaw AI Blog: read practical guidance on AI use, immigration workflows, legal tech, and product updates.
- Security and Privacy: review Visalaw AI's data handling and retention practices.
- Book a Demo: schedule a personalized walkthrough for your firm.

Attorney review reminder: Visalaw AI is designed to support immigration professionals by organizing information, surfacing issues, and generating structured drafts. Review all outputs for accuracy, completeness, and case strategy before relying on them or filing.