Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) · Authorship + Original Contributions

Ruiping Wang

MD Anderson Cancer Center

Google Scholar profile

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to the 8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) outstanding-researcher criteria — particularly (iii) published material and (v) original scientific or scholarly contributions. 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

8	8	1	27
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.

87.5% independent of 8 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
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 identified specific infusion product characteristics of anti-CD19 CAR T cells that correlate with clinical efficacy and toxicity in large B cell lymphoma patients.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution involves characterizing the attributes of anti-CD19 CAR T cell infusion products to determine their association with treatment efficacy and toxicity in patients with large B cell lymphomas, as detailed in a 2020 Nature Medicine paper.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the critical need for understanding how specific product characteristics influence clinical outcomes in CAR T cell therapy. By focusing on the correlation between infusion product traits and patient responses, the research provides a framework for optimizing therapeutic protocols and managing adverse events in large B cell lymphoma treatment.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has garnered 654 citations, indicating substantial uptake within the scientific community. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the findings have been widely adopted and validated by external groups rather than solely by the researcher's immediate collaborators.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

Characteristics of anti-CD19 CAR T cell infusion products associated with efficacy and toxicity in patients with large B cell lymphomas

2020 · Nature Medicine · 654 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 468 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2020 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Applications of single-cell RNA sequencing in drug discovery and development (2023)	AbbVie Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc., Bristol Myers Squibb	Belgium, France, United Kingdom	—
2	Safety, efficacy and determinants of response of allogeneic CD19-specific CAR-NK cells in CD19+ B cell tumors: a phase 1/2 trial (2024)	The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center	United States	—
3	Harnessing the potential of hydrogels for advanced therapeutic applications: current achievements and future directions (2024)	Chengdu Second People's Hospital, Sun Yat-sen University, The First Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University	China, PR China	—
4	Long-term outcomes following CAR T cell therapy: what we know so far (2023)	National Cancer Institute	United States	—
5	CAR T cell therapy for patients with solid tumours: key lessons to learn and unlearn (2023)	University of Pennsylvania	United States	—
6	Dynamics and specificities of T cells in cancer immunotherapy (2023)	Dana-Farber Cancer Institute	United States	—
7	CAR-T cell manufacturing: Major process parameters and next-generation strategies (2024)	University of California-Los Angeles, University of California, Los Angeles	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
The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center	United States	—	2
University of Pennsylvania	United States	SCImago #52 · THE 14 · QS 15	1
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute	United States	SCImago #197	1
GlaxoSmithKline	United States	SCImago #411	1
European Bioinformatics Institute	United Kingdom	—	1
The First Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University	China	SCImago #1680	1
UCB Pharma	Belgium	—	1
Sanofi	United States	SCImago #317	1
Eisai	United States	—	1
Prometheus Biosciences	United States	—	1
Moderna Inc.	United States	SCImago #54	1
Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc.	United States	—	1
Bristol Myers Squibb	United States	—	1
AbbVie Inc.	United States	—	1
Magnet Biomedicine	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	7
China	2
Belgium	1
France	1
PR China	1
United Kingdom	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	Characteristics of anti-CD19 CAR T cell infusion products associated with efficacy and toxicity in patients with large B cell lymphomas	7	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) — Outstanding Researcher