Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Giray Eryilmaz

The Jackson Laboratory

Google Scholar profile

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to Prong 2 of Matter of Dhanasar (the petitioner is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor) — the prong where past citation evidence is most probative. 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

16	16	13	4
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.

81.3% independent of 16 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	13
Self-citation	1
Co-author	2
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 developed a comprehensive single-cell atlas of healthy mammary tissues, identifying shared epigenomic and transcriptomic signatures linking aging and cancer.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the creation of a detailed single-cell atlas of healthy mammary tissues, as presented in their 2025 paper. This work focuses on revealing shared epigenomic and transcriptomic signatures that connect the processes of aging and cancer.

ORIGINALITY: This line of work appears to address the need for high-resolution, single-cell level understanding of healthy mammary tissue. By mapping these tissues, the researcher provides a foundational resource that distinguishes normal aging signatures from those associated with cancer, offering a novel perspective on their shared molecular underpinnings.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has garnered 46 citations, indicating strong engagement with the scientific community. Notably, 93.8% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that this work has been widely adopted and utilized by external groups to advance their own studies in aging and oncology.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

Comprehensive single-cell aging atlas of healthy mammary tissues reveals shared epigenomic and transcriptomic signatures of aging and cancer

2025 · 46 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 31 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Medicine papers from 2025 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Ageing, immune fitness and cancer (2025)	Brigham & Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Ragon Institute of Mass General Brigham, MIT, and Harvard	United States	—
2	Plasticity and Functional Heterogeneity of Cancer-Associated Fibroblasts (2025)	Drexel University College of Medicine, Lankenau Institute for Medical Research, Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center, Thomas Jefferson University	United States	—
3	A quantitative spatial cell-cell colocalizations framework enabling comparisons between in vitro assembloids and pathological specimens (2025)	Stanford University	United States	—
4	Mechanistic insights and biomarker discovery in immune cell aging and age-associated diseases (2025)	Brigham and Women's Hospital, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Mass General Hospital, and Harvard Medical School, Emory University	United States	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The **S2** column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Harvard Medical School	United States	SCImago #12	3
The Jackson Laboratory for Genomic Medicine	United States	—	3
Stony Brook University	United States	SCImago #993 · THE 301–350	2
Durham VA Health Care System	United States	—	1
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute and Harvard Medical School	United States	—	1
Emory University	United States	SCImago #217 · THE 102 · QS 182	1
Brigham & Women's Hospital	United States	SCImago #130	1
Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center, Thomas Jefferson University	—	—	1
Brigham and Women's Hospital, Mass General Hospital, and Harvard Medical School	United States	—	1
Imperial College London, Hammersmith Hospital	United Kingdom	—	1
Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, AP-HP	—	—	1
Sorbonne Université, INSERM	France	—	1
Institut Necker-Enfants Malades	France	SCImago #1342	1
Cochin Hospital, AP-HP	France	—	1
Affiliated Hospital of Youjiang Medical University for Nationalities	China	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	13
Canada	2
United Kingdom	2
France	1
Singapore	1
Switzerland	1
China	1
Estonia	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	Comprehensive single-cell aging atlas of healthy mammary tissues reveals shared epigenomic and transcriptomic signatures of aging and cancer	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)