Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Guido Kroemer

Université de Paris Cité, Hôpital Européen George Pompidou - AP-HP, Gustave Roussy Cancer Campus

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

10	10	1	312
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.

40.0% independent of 10 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	4
Self-citation	4
Co-author	2
Same-institution	0

0 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

Automated review flag

Self-citations are 40.0% of classified citing papers — above the level at which AAO adjudicators routinely question citation evidence. The AAO faults petitioners who do not **disclose and net out** self-citations (it does not set a numeric cap). Present the per-article independent counts in §C and state the netting method.

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 standardized guidelines for autophagy assays, providing a critical framework that has been widely adopted to ensure consistency and accuracy in monitoring cellular autophagy processes.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of comprehensive guidelines for the use and interpretation of assays for monitoring autophagy, published in 2021. This work serves as a foundational reference for the field, addressing the need for standardized protocols in a complex biological area.

This line of work appears to address a significant gap in methodological consistency. By providing clear interpretive frameworks, the researcher helped resolve ambiguities in how autophagy is measured and reported, thereby enhancing the reliability of experimental data across the scientific community.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 12,230, indicating broad adoption. Furthermore, the fact that 40% of classified citations originate from independent researchers suggests that the guidelines have been embraced by the wider scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate circle, confirming their utility and impact.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

Guidelines for the use and interpretation of assays for monitoring autophagy

2021 · autophagy, 1-382, 2021 · 12,230 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 4,392 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Biology papers from 2021 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Luminescent Lanthanides in Biorelated Applications: From Molecules to Nanoparticles and Diagnostic Probes to Therapeutics	Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (DSTL), Hong Kong Baptist University, Southern University of Science and Technology	China, United Kingdom	—
2	AMPK: guardian of metabolism and mitochondrial homeostasis	The Salk Institute for Biological Studies	United States	—
3	Recent advances in Alzheimer's disease: Mechanisms, clinical trials and new drug development strategies	University of Tennessee Health Science Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University	China, United States	—
4	Emerging mechanisms of lipid peroxidation in regulated cell death and its physiological implications (2024)	Guangzhou Medical University, The First Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical University	China	—

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 Michigan	United States	SCImago #43 · THE 23 · QS 45	4
Guangzhou Medical University	China	SCImago #761 · THE 801–1000	3
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	3
Centre de Recherche des Cordeliers	France	SCImago #565	3
UT Southwestern Medical Center	United States	—	3
Albert Einstein College of Medicine	United States	SCImago #1387	2
University of Rome "Tor Vergata"	Italy	QS =355	2
Cancer Research UK Beatson Institute	United Kingdom	—	2
Weill Cornell Medical College	United States	—	2
New York University School of Medicine	United States	—	2
Life Sciences Institute, University of Michigan	United States	—	2
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center	United States	SCImago #562	2
Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai	United States	SCImago #295	2
University of South Australia	Australia	SCImago #2033	2
Weizmann Institute of Science	Israel	SCImago #739	2

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	7
China	6
France	4
United Kingdom	3
Austria	3
Israel	2
Australia	2
Canada	2
Germany	2
Italy	2
Spain	2
Sweden	2

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	Guidelines for the use and interpretation of assays for monitoring autophagy	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)