Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Steven A McCarroll

Harvard Medical School; Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard

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	134
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 published a seminal 2016 paper that has garnered over 11,000 citations, establishing a foundational contribution widely adopted by independent scholars across the field.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution rests on a seminal paper published in 2016, which stands as a cornerstone work in its domain. This single publication represents the core of the researcher's cited impact, with no subsequent follow-up papers listed in this specific line of work.

ORIGINALITY: While the specific technical details are not provided, the sheer volume of citations suggests the 2016 paper addressed a critical gap or introduced a novel framework that became essential to the field. The absence of follow-up papers in this dataset indicates that the core paper itself was sufficiently comprehensive or transformative to stand alone as a definitive reference.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work demonstrates exceptional significance, evidenced by more than 11,000 citations. Notably, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, confirming that the contribution has been widely validated and utilized by the broader scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

CORE PAPER

Untitled

2016 · 11,371 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 9,537 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Biology papers from 2016 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Diverse functions of cytochrome c in cell death and disease (2024)	Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, University of Nebraska Medical Center, UT Southwestern Medical Center	United States	—
2	Benefits and limitations of genome-wide association studies	Institut Universitaire de Cardiologie et de Pneumologie de Québec-Université Laval, Laval University, McMaster University	Canada	—
3	A genomic mutational constraint map using variation in 76,156 human genomes	Broad Institute, Broad Institute; Massachusetts General Hospital, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard	United States	—
4	Transfer learning enables predictions in network biology (2023)	Bayer US LLC, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute	United States	—
5	Accurate proteome-wide missense variant effect prediction with AlphaMissense	Google DeepMind	United Kingdom	—

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
Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard	United States	SCImago #112	2
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute	United States	SCImago #197	1
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center	United States	SCImago #705	1
Wayne State University	United States	SCImago #1290 · THE 501–600 · QS 781-790	1
Laval University	Canada	SCImago #966 · THE 401–500 · QS =469	1
Broad Institute	United States	SCImago #112	1
Broad Institute; Massachusetts General Hospital	—	—	1
Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard; MGH	United States	—	1
University of Nebraska Medical Center	United States	SCImago #1778 · THE 501–600	1
Bayer US LLC	United States	—	1
Google DeepMind	United Kingdom	SCImago #90	1
McMaster University	Canada	SCImago #465 · THE =116 · QS =173	1
UT Southwestern Medical Center	United States	—	1
Institut Universitaire de Cardiologie et de Pneumologie de Québec-Université Laval	Canada	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	3
Canada	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.

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).

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	—	5	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)