

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

David Salesin

Google

[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

218

Citing papers mapped

251

Citation edges

154

Home papers mapped

78

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.

100.0% independent of 1 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	1
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
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 introduced a seminal framework for image analogies, establishing a foundational method for transferring visual styles that has become a cornerstone of computational photography research.

The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a novel approach to image analogies, as detailed in the core paper published in the SIGGRAPH 2001 Conference Proceedings. This work stands as a singular, foundational piece in this specific line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher building directly upon it in the provided data.

This line of work appears to address the challenge of transferring visual relationships or styles between images, a problem that was likely underserved by existing methods at the time. The publication in a top-tier venue like SIGGRAPH suggests the approach offered a significant methodological advance, providing a robust mechanism for defining and applying visual analogies that differed from prior techniques.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 2432, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, the citation analysis reveals that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work’s broad impact beyond the researcher’s immediate circle and confirming its status as a widely recognized standard in the community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

[Image Analogies](#)

2023 · SIGGRAPH 2001 Conference Proceedings · 2,445 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,924 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2023 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Semantic Image Synthesis with Spatially-Adaptive Normalization (2019)	MIT, NVIDIA, University of California Berkeley	United States	Background

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column carries Semantic Scholar’s read of each citation — *Methodology / Result* (the citing work used the method or built on the finding — the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits), *Influential* (S2’s isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Huazhong University of Science and Technology	China	SCImago #25 · THE =176 · QS 319	2
MIT	United States	—	1
Xidian University	China	SCImago #269 · THE 601–800	1
South China University of Technology	China	SCImago #111 · THE 251–300 · QS 377	1
University of Macau	China	SCImago #942 · THE =145 · QS =285	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Sichuan University	China	SCImago #32 · THE 201–250 · QS =324	1
University of California Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	1
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	1
Tianjin University	China	SCImago #90 · THE 201–250 · QS =257	1
University of California, Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	1
NVIDIA	United States	—	1
Zhejiang University	China	SCImago #6 · THE 39 · QS 49	1
Guangzhou University	China	SCImago #1234	1
Hefei University of Technology	China	SCImago #638	1
Anhui University	China	SCImago #1226 · THE 1001–1200	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
China	11
United States	4
Ireland	1
South Korea	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.

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	Image Analogies	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)