Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Gordon Guyatt

Professor of Medicine, McMaster university

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

21	22	3	321
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.

71.4% independent of 21 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	15
Self-citation	0
Co-author	6
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 seminal framework for rating evidence quality and recommendation strength, creating a widely adopted consensus standard in medical literature.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a standardized approach for assessing the quality of evidence and the strength of clinical recommendations. This work is anchored in the 2008 publication in the BMJ, which introduced a framework that appears to have become a foundational reference in the field.

This line of work addresses the critical need for consistent, transparent methods in evaluating medical evidence. By proposing an emerging consensus, the researcher provided a structured methodology that likely helped resolve ambiguities in how clinical guidelines are formulated and interpreted.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating over 27,000 citations. Furthermore, the high proportion of independent citations suggests that the framework has been widely adopted and utilized by researchers outside the author's immediate circle, indicating broad impact across the global medical community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

CORE PAPER

GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations

2008 · BMJ (British Medical Journal) · 27,351 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 14,869 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2008 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	World guidelines for falls prevention and management for older adults: a global initiative (2022)	Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Amsterdam UMC, Boston University	Argentina, Australia, Belgium	—
2	European Association of Urology Guidelines on Muscle-invasive and Metastatic Bladder Cancer: Summary of the 2023 Guidelines (2024)	EAU Guidelines Office, Foch Hospital, University of Versailles-Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, Inselspital, University Hospital Bern	Austria, Finland, France	—

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.

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher established the PRISMA statement, a seminal reporting guideline that standardized the transparency and completeness of systematic reviews and meta-analyses across biomedical and health research fields.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of the PRISMA statement, introduced in a 2009 paper published in PLOS Medicine. This work serves as the foundational core of this line of research, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher listed in the provided data, indicating the statement itself stands as a singular, definitive output.

This work appears to address the critical need for standardized reporting in systematic reviews and meta-analyses. By establishing a structured framework, the researcher provided a clear methodology for authors to ensure transparency and completeness, thereby addressing gaps in how such studies were previously documented and evaluated.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating over 170,000 citations. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 85.7% of citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the PRISMA statement has been widely adopted and relied upon by the broader scientific community as a standard tool.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 9 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement

2009 · PLOS Medicine · 170,227 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 119,964 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour	Halmstad University, Harvard Medical School, The University of Queensland	Australia, Sweden, United Kingdom	Influential
2	Virtual reality in education: a review of learning theories, approaches and methodologies for the last decade	University of West Attica	Greece	—
3	When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis (2024)	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	—
4	Systematic review and meta-analysis of AI-based conversational agents for promoting mental health and well-being	Carnegie Mellon University, National University of Singapore, Northwestern University	Singapore, United States	—
5	How to combine and clean bibliometric data and use bibliometric tools synergistically: Guidelines using metaverse research (2024)	Georgia State University, Indian Institute of Management Nagpur, Sunway University	India, Malaysia, United States	—
6	Model aggregation techniques in federated learning: A comprehensive survey (2024)	University of Calabria, University of Naples Federico II	Italy	—
7	A systematic review of industrial wastewater management: Evaluating challenges and enablers	Ambala College of Engineering and Applied Research, Federation University, MM Engineering College, Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University	Australia, India	—
8	Emotion recognition and Artificial Intelligence: A Systematic Review (2014-2023) and Research Recommendations (2024)	University of Southern Denmark, University of Southern Queensland	Australia, Denmark	—
9	Smarter eco-cities and their leading-edge artificial intelligence of things solutions for environmental sustainability: A comprehensive systematic review (2023)	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway, Switzerland	—

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.

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established updated reporting guidelines for parallel group randomised trials, significantly enhancing transparency and standardization in clinical trial documentation across major medical journals.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of updated reporting guidelines for parallel group randomised trials, as evidenced by the seminal 2010 paper published in high-impact venues including BMJ, PLoS Medicine, and The Lancet. This work serves as the foundational reference for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher listed, indicating the core paper stands alone as the definitive contribution.

This line of work appears to address the critical need for standardized reporting practices in clinical research. By updating existing guidelines, the researcher likely aimed to improve the clarity, completeness, and reproducibility of trial results. The publication across multiple prestigious journals suggests a concerted effort to disseminate these standards widely within the medical and scientific communities.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating 28,771 citations. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 85.7% originate from independent researchers, indicating broad adoption and influence beyond the researcher's immediate circle. This high level of independent citation demonstrates that the guidelines have become a standard reference point for the global research community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials

2010 · BMJ; PLoS Medicine; The Lancet; Annals of Internal Medicine; Trials; Journal of Clinical Epidemiology; Obstetrics & Gynecology; Open Medicine · 28,771 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,530 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2010 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The REporting of A Disproportionality Analysis for DrUg Safety Signal Detection Using Individual Case Safety Reports in PharmacoVigilance (READUS-PV): Explanation and Elaboration (2024)	Almaarefa University, Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Bayer AG	Canada, France, Germany	—
2	An Integrated TCGA Pan-Cancer Clinical Data Resource to Drive High-Quality Survival Outcome Analytics (2018)	Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Buck Institute for Research on Aging, Chan Soon-Shiong Institute of Molecular Medicine at Windber	United States	—
3	Intracerebroventricular bivalent CAR T cells targeting EGFR and IL-13Rα2 in recurrent glioblastoma: a phase 1 trial	University of Pennsylvania	United States	—
4	Generative Artificial Intelligence in Medicine	Byers Eye Institute, Cornell Tech, Duke University	Canada, Singapore, 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
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	5
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	5
University of Southern Denmark	Denmark	SCImago #884 · THE 251–300 · QS =303	5
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	4
Ottawa Hospital Research Institute	Canada	SCImago #2914	4
University of Alberta	Canada	SCImago #262 · THE 119 · QS =94	4
Bond University	Australia	SCImago #5650 · THE 401–500 · QS =591	3
University of Toronto	Canada	SCImago #39 · THE 21 · QS 29	3
Stanford University	United States	SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3	3
University of Glasgow	United Kingdom	SCImago #351 · THE 84 · QS 79	3
University of California, Los Angeles	United States	SCImago #70 · THE =18 · QS 46	3
University of Exeter	United Kingdom	SCImago #679 · THE =170 · QS =155	3
University of York	United Kingdom	SCImago #890 · THE =154 · QS 169	3
McMaster University	Canada	SCImago #465 · THE =116 · QS =173	3
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	United States	THE 78 · QS =140	3

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	15
United Kingdom	9
Australia	8
Canada	8
France	6
Netherlands	6
India	5
Denmark	5
Italy	4
Germany	3
Switzerland	3

Country	Citing papers
Singapore	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	GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations	2	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement	9	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)