

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Anastasia Ivanova

Associate Professor of Biostatistics, UNC at Chapel Hill

[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

<b>3</b> Citing papers mapped	<b>3</b> Citation edges	<b>1</b> Home papers mapped	<b>52</b> 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 3 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	3
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 established a comparative framework for endometrial cancer staging by evaluating sentinel lymph node biopsy against lymphadenectomy in a large multicentre prospective cohort study.*

The researcher’s primary contribution rests on a seminal 2017 study published in *The Lancet Oncology*, which compared sentinel lymph node biopsy to lymphadenectomy for endometrial cancer staging. This work appears to address a critical clinical gap by providing robust, multicentre prospective data on surgical staging methods, potentially offering a less invasive alternative to traditional lymphadenectomy. The titles suggest a focus on rigorous comparative effectiveness within a large cohort, aiming to refine standard-of-care protocols for endometrial cancer patients.

The significance of this line of work is evidenced by its substantial uptake in the scientific community, with the core paper accumulating over 1,000 citations. Notably, analysis of citing literature indicates that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, rather than the author’s own institution or collaborators. This high degree of independent citation suggests the findings have been widely adopted and validated by the broader oncology community, reinforcing the work’s impact on clinical practice and research directions in gynecologic oncology.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

#### CORE PAPER

### [A comparison of sentinel lymph node biopsy to lymphadenectomy for endometrial cancer staging \(FIRES trial\): a multicentre, prospective, cohort study](#)

2017 · *The Lancet Oncology* · 1,074 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 775 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2017 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Endometrial cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guideline for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up</a> (2022)	Catholic University of Sacred Heart, Ev. Kliniken Essen-Mitte, Instituto Alexander Fleming	Argentina, Austria, Denmark	—
2	<a href="#">Near-infrared fluorescence for detection of sentinel lymph nodes in women with cervical and uterine cancers (FILM): a randomised, phase 3, multicentre, non-inferiority trial</a> (2018)	Duke University Medical Center, Laval University, CHU de Quebec, L’Hotel-Dieu de Quebec, University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center	Canada, United States	—
3	<a href="#">Molecular Classification of Endometrial Cancer and Its Impact on Therapy Selection</a> (2024)	Institute of Genetics and Immunology, Medical University of Lublin, Polish Mother’s Memorial Hospital-Research Institute	Poland	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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

## D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

---

### Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Institute of Genetics and Immunology	—	—	1
Polish Mother's Memorial Hospital-Research Institute	Poland	—	1
Duke University Medical Center	United States	—	1
Leiden University Medical Center	Netherlands	SCImago #412	1
Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital	Denmark	—	1
University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center	United States	—	1
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	1
Vall d'Hebron Institute of Oncology	Spain	—	1
Medical University of Lublin	Poland	SCImago #2936 · THE 1201–1500	1
Medical University Innsbruck	Austria	—	1
Instituto Alexander Fleming	Argentina	—	1
Ev. Kliniken Essen-Mitte	Germany	—	1
Normandie University	France	—	1
Catholic University of Sacred Heart	Italy	—	1
Istituto Europeo di Oncologia IRCCS	Italy	—	1

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	2
Austria	1
Canada	1
Denmark	1
France	1
Germany	1
Argentina	1
Netherlands	1
Poland	1
Spain	1
United Kingdom	1
Italy	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	A comparison of sentinel lymph node biopsy to lymphadenectomy for endometrial cancer staging (FIRES trial): a multicentre, prospective, cohort study	3	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)