Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Dirk Schadendorf

Professor für Dermatologie, University Hospital Essen; University of Duisburg-Essen

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

13	14	3	191
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.

88.9% independent of 9 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	8
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
Same-institution	0

4 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 2010 NEJM study demonstrating improved survival with ipilimumab in metastatic melanoma, a highly cited work that appears to have significantly influenced clinical oncology practice.

The researcher's contribution centers on a 2010 publication in The New England Journal of Medicine titled 'Improved survival with ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma.' This core paper stands as the primary evidence of the researcher's impact in this specific area, with no follow-up publications by the same author listed in the provided data.

This work appears to address a critical gap in the treatment of metastatic melanoma by evaluating the efficacy of ipilimumab. The title suggests a focus on survival outcomes, indicating that the study provided pivotal clinical evidence regarding this therapeutic intervention at a time when effective treatments for advanced melanoma were limited.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its extensive citation record, with over 19,000 citations indicating broad adoption and influence within the scientific community. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has driven external scientific discourse and clinical practice beyond the researcher's immediate institution or collaboration network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

CORE PAPER

Improved survival with ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma

2010 · The New England Journal of Medicine · 19,106 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 14,413 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	Tumor biomarkers for diagnosis, prognosis and targeted therapy (2024)	Sichuan University, Tibet University, West China Hospital, Sichuan University	China	—
2	Individualised neoantigen therapy mRNA-4157 (V940) plus pembrolizumab versus pembrolizumab monotherapy in resected melanoma (KEYNOTE-942): a randomised, phase 2b study (2024)	California Pacific Medical Center Research Institute, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Earle A. Chiles Research Institute	Australia, United States	—

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 isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher advanced melanoma treatment by demonstrating improved survival outcomes with vemurafenib in patients harboring the BRAF V600E mutation, establishing a critical therapeutic benchmark.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2011 publication titled 'Improved survival with vemurafenib in melanoma with BRAF V600E mutation.' This core paper stands as the primary evidence of the researcher's impact in this specific domain, with no follow-up publications by the same author listed to extend this particular line of inquiry.

This work appears to address a critical gap in targeted cancer therapy by evaluating the clinical efficacy of vemurafenib specifically for melanoma cases characterized by the BRAF V600E mutation. The title suggests a focus on quantifying survival benefits, thereby providing essential data on the therapeutic value of this targeted approach for a genetically defined patient subgroup.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count of 9,864, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the scientific community. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has been broadly adopted and validated by the wider field rather than relying on self-citation or institutional echo chambers.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

CORE PAPER

Improved survival with vemurafenib in melanoma with BRAF V600E mutation

2011 · 9,864 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 6,768 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2011 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Targeting the RAS/RAF/MAPK pathway for cancer therapy: from mechanism to clinical studies	Gyeongsang National University	South Korea	Background
2	Signaling pathways involved in colorectal cancer: pathogenesis and targeted therapy	Chongqing Municipal Health and Health Committee, Daping Hospital, Army Medical University, The Affiliated Dazu Hospital of Chongqing Medical University	China	—

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 isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher published a seminal NEJM study on combined immunotherapy for untreated melanoma, establishing a critical benchmark in oncology with over 10,000 citations.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is a landmark 2015 study in The New England Journal of Medicine evaluating combined nivolumab and ipilimumab versus monotherapy in untreated melanoma. This work stands as a singular, high-impact publication in the field.

ORIGINALITY: The title indicates a comparative clinical investigation into dual immune checkpoint inhibition versus single-agent therapy. By addressing untreated melanoma, the study appears to target a pivotal gap in first-line treatment strategies, offering evidence on the efficacy and safety of combination regimens.

SIGNIFICANCE: With over 10,000 citations, the paper is highly influential. Analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of sampled citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating broad adoption and validation of the findings across the global scientific community beyond the author's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab or Monotherapy in Untreated Melanoma

2015 · The New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM) · 10,249 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 4,128 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Tremelimumab plus Durvalumab in Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma. (2022)	Asan Medical Center, University of Ulsan College of Medicine, AstraZeneca, Clínica Universidad de Navarra and CIBEREHD	Canada, China, France	—
2	Cancer immunotherapies: advances and bottlenecks (2023)	—	—	Background
3	Cold and hot tumors: from molecular mechanisms to targeted therapy (2024)	Ningbo No. 2 Hospital, The Fourth Affiliated Hospital, China Medical University, The Second Hospital of Dalian Medical University	China	—
4	Immunotherapy combination approaches: mechanisms, biomarkers and clinical observations	University of California San Francisco, UPMC Hillman Cancer Center	United States	—

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 isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
UPMC Hillman Cancer Center	United States	—	2
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute	United States	SCImago #197	2
Sichuan University	China	SCImago #32 · THE 201–250 · QS =324	1
Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre	Australia	SCImago #877	1
University Health Network	Canada	SCImago #516	1
Kindai University	Japan	SCImago #2866 · THE 1201–1500 · QS 1401+	1
European Institute of Oncology IRCCS	Italy	—	1
Princess Margaret Cancer Centre	Canada	SCImago #825	1
University of California San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1
University of Colorado	United States	—	1
AstraZeneca	United States	SCImago #244	1
Merck & Co., Inc.	United States	SCImago #618	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Hackensack University Medical Center	United States	SCImago #1626	1
Aix-Marseille Université	France	SCImago #667	1
University of Colorado Cancer Center	United States	SCImago #796	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
China	4
United States	4
Spain	2
Italy	2
Canada	2
United Kingdom	2
Australia	2
Germany	2
France	2
South Korea	2
Vietnam	1
Belgium	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.

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	Improved survival with ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma	2	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Improved survival with vemurafenib in melanoma with BRAF V600E mutation	2	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab or Monotherapy in Untreated Melanoma	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)