Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Emma K. Adam

Edwina S. Tarry Professor of Human Development and Social Policy, Northwestern University

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

5	5	1	70
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.

100.0% independent of 5 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	5
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 conducted a randomized social experiment published in the New England Journal of Medicine to investigate the causal relationship between neighborhood environments, obesity, and diabetes.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is a seminal study titled "Neighborhoods, Obesity and Diabetes — A Randomized Social Experiment," published in 2011 in the New England Journal of Medicine. This work represents a distinct line of inquiry into the social determinants of health, specifically focusing on how residential environments influence metabolic outcomes.

ORIGINALITY: The titles indicate that this research addresses the complex interplay between built environments and public health. By employing a randomized social experiment, the work appears to move beyond observational correlations to establish causal links between neighborhood characteristics and the prevalence of obesity and diabetes. This methodological approach suggests a novel attempt to isolate environmental factors as drivers of chronic disease.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated 1,295 citations, indicating substantial uptake within the scientific community. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has resonated broadly across the field rather than being confined to the researcher's immediate circle. This widespread independent engagement underscores the study's impact on shaping subsequent discourse regarding social interventions for metabolic health.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

CORE PAPER

Neighborhoods, Obesity and Diabetes — A Randomized Social Experiment

2011 · New England Journal of Medicine · 1,295 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 912 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2011 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The multiple roles of life stress in metabolic disorders (2023)	Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, University College London, University of Minnesota	United Kingdom, United States	—
2	Obesity: global epidemiology and pathogenesis (2019)	University of Leipzig	Germany	—
3	Social Determinants of Health and Diabetes: A Scientific Review (2020)	Columbia University, Johns Hopkins University, National Institutes of Health	United States	—
4	The Lancet Commission on diabetes: using data to transform diabetes care and patient lives. (2020)	Baker Heart and Diabetes Institute, Prince of Wales Hospital, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, University of Cambridge	Australia, China, United Kingdom	—
5	Exercise/Physical Activity in Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes: A Consensus Statement from the American College of Sports Medicine (2022)	Karolinska Institute, Old Dominion University, Oregon Health and Science University-Portland State University	Sweden, 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
University of Pittsburgh	United States	SCImago #212 · QS =281	2
Prince of Wales Hospital, The Chinese University of Hong Kong	China	—	1
Shore Physicians Group	United States	—	1
Oregon Health and Science University-Portland State University	United States	—	1
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	SCImago #63 · THE =3 · QS 6	1
Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health	United States	—	1
University of California San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1
University of Leipzig	Germany	—	1
University of Missouri	United States	—	1
Columbia University	United States	SCImago #65 · THE 20 · QS =38	1
University of Minnesota	United States	SCImago #165 · THE 88 · QS 210	1
National Institutes of Health	United States	SCImago #44	1
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	1
University of Chicago	United States	SCImago #124 · THE 15 · QS 13	1
Johns Hopkins University	United States	SCImago #33 · THE 16 · QS 24	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	4
United Kingdom	2
Australia	1
China	1
Germany	1
Sweden	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	Neighborhoods, Obesity and Diabetes — A Randomized Social Experiment	5	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)