

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Montserrat Garcia-Closas

Deputy Director, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute

[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

9 Citing papers mapped	10 Citation edges	2 Home papers mapped	125 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 9 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	9
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 developed a statistical framework for assessing false positive probabilities in molecular epidemiology, establishing a rigorous methodological standard widely adopted by independent scientists.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a statistical approach for evaluating the probability that a positive report is false within molecular epidemiology studies. This work is anchored by a seminal 2004 paper published in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, which has accumulated nearly 2,000 citations. The titles indicate that this research addresses the critical need for rigorous error assessment in molecular data interpretation, a gap that appears to have been filled by this specific methodological framework. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests that this single publication established a definitive standard that did not require further refinement by the original creator. The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake in the scientific community. With nearly 2,000 citations, the work has clearly influenced subsequent research in the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that the methodology has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

[Assessing the Probability That a Positive Report is False: An Approach for Molecular Epidemiology Studies](#)

2004 · JNCI Journal of the National Cancer Institute · 1,965 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,120 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2004 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Genome-wide association studies for complex traits: consensus, uncertainty and challenges (2008)	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	—

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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher identified novel breast cancer susceptibility loci through a genome-wide association study, establishing a foundational reference for genetic risk assessment in the field.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the identification of novel breast cancer susceptibility loci via a genome-wide association study, as detailed in their 2007 publication. This work serves as the cornerstone of their cited research portfolio.

ORIGINALITY: The title indicates a shift toward comprehensive, genome-wide scanning methods to uncover genetic variants associated with breast cancer risk. By identifying 'novel' loci, the work appears to have expanded the known genetic architecture of the disease beyond previously established markers, addressing a critical gap in understanding hereditary susceptibility.

SIGNIFICANCE: With nearly 3,000 citations, this paper is highly influential. Analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating broad adoption and validation of these findings across the global scientific community rather than isolated institutional interest.

CORE PAPER

Genome-wide association study identifies novel breast cancer susceptibility loci

2007 · 2,927 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,348 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2007 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The personal and clinical utility of polygenic risk scores. (2018)	Scripps Health, The Scripps Research Institute	United States	—
2	Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities (2019)	Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Massachusetts General Hospital, Osaka University Graduate School of Medicine	Japan, United States	—
3	Cancer health disparities in racial/ethnic minorities in the United States (2020)	Beckman Research Institute of City of Hope, Boston University, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School	Argentina, Puerto Rico, United States	—
4	Fibroblast growth factor signalling: from development to cancer (2010)	Queen Mary University of London, The Institute of Cancer Research	United Kingdom	—
5	The Pathogenesis of Endometriosis: Molecular and Cell Biology Insights (2019)	Münster University Hospital, San Raffaele Scientific Institute, University of Insubria	Germany, Italy, United States	—
6	Variance component model to account for sample structure in genome-wide association studies (2010)	University of California, Los Angeles, University of Michigan	United States	—
7	Genome-wide association studies for complex traits: consensus, uncertainty and challenges (2008)	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	—
8	Genetic architectures of psychiatric disorders: the emerging picture and its implications (2012)	Cardiff University, Harvard University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	United Kingdom, United States	—
9	Breast Cancer: Epidemiology and Etiology (2014)	Nanjing Medical University, Xuzhou Central Hospital	China	—

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
University of Michigan	United States	SCImago #43 · THE 23 · QS 45	2

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School	United States	—	1
University of California San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1
Washington University School of Medicine	United States	—	1
University of California Davis	United States	SCImago #194 · THE 64 · QS =114	1
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center	United States	SCImago #705	1
Cardiff University	United Kingdom	SCImago #664 · THE 201–250 · QS 181	1
University of Verona	Italy	SCImago #1638	1
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	1
Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT	United States	—	1
Boston University	United States	SCImago #272 · THE =76 · QS =88	1
University of California, San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1
The Institute of Cancer Research	United Kingdom	SCImago #453	1
Massachusetts General Hospital	United States	SCImago #100	1
Queen Mary University of London	United Kingdom	SCImago #416 · THE =134 · QS =110	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	6
United Kingdom	3
Germany	1
Italy	1
Argentina	1
Puerto Rico	1
Japan	1
China	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.

2010  2

2019  2

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	Assessing the Probability That a Positive Report is False: An Approach for Molecular Epidemiology Studies	1	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Genome-wide association study identifies novel breast cancer susceptibility loci	9	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)