

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Tali Dekel

Associate Professor, Weizmann Institute of Science; Research Scientist, Google DeepMind

[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

2	2	1	38
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 2 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	2
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 Imagic, a diffusion-based framework for text-guided real image editing, establishing a significant benchmark in generative computer vision as evidenced by over 1,600 citations.*

The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of Imagic, a method for text-based real image editing using diffusion models, published in the prestigious Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) in 2023. This work stands as a seminal piece in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher listed in this specific line of inquiry, allowing the core publication to serve as the definitive statement of this technical achievement.

This line of work appears to address the challenge of manipulating real-world images through natural language instructions within the diffusion model paradigm. By focusing on real image editing rather than synthetic generation, the research suggests a novel approach to bridging the gap between textual semantics and photorealistic visual modifications, a critical advancement in the evolution of generative AI tools.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count of 1,635, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the academic community. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has resonated beyond the researcher’s immediate institutional circle and has become a foundational reference for independent scholars in computer vision.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

#### CORE PAPER

### [Imagic: Text-Based Real Image Editing with Diffusion Models](#)

2023 · Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) · 1,635 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,442 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2023 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Adding Conditional Control to Text-to-Image Diffusion Models</a> (2023)	Stanford University	United States	—
2	<a href="#">Diffusion Models: A Comprehensive Survey of Methods and Applications</a> (2023)	Carnegie Mellon University, OpenAI, Peking University	China, 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
University of California, Merced	United States	SCImago #1812 · THE 401–500	1
University of California, Los Angeles	United States	SCImago #70 · THE =18 · QS 46	1
University of California at Merced	United States	—	1
OpenAI	United States	—	1
Stanford University	United States	SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Carnegie Mellon University	United States	SCImago #266 · THE 24 · QS 52	1
Peking University	China	SCImago #11 · THE 13 · QS 14	1

## Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	2
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.

2023  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.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Core paper</b>	<b>Indep. cites</b>	<b>Supports</b>
Contribution 1	Imagic: Text-Based Real Image Editing with Diffusion Models	2	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)