

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Renwei Wang

University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute

[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 Citing papers mapped	2 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	67 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 established a large-scale epidemiological link between BMI and mortality risk in Asian populations, providing critical data that challenges existing Western-centric health models.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the publication of a seminal study in the New England Journal of Medicine examining the association between body-mass index and death risk in over one million Asians. This work stands as a standalone cornerstone of their research portfolio, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author building directly upon it.

ORIGINALITY: The titles indicate that this line of work addresses a significant gap in epidemiological data by focusing specifically on Asian populations. Prior to this, much of the global understanding of BMI-related mortality risks was derived from Western cohorts. By analyzing a cohort exceeding one million individuals, the researcher appears to have provided a robust, population-specific assessment that challenges or refines universal assumptions about weight and health outcomes.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated 1,128 citations, indicating it is a highly influential reference in the field. Furthermore, citation analysis reveals that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, rather than the author’s own network. This high degree of independent uptake suggests the work has been widely accepted and utilized by the broader scientific community to inform subsequent studies on obesity and mortality.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

CORE PAPER

[Association between body-mass index and risk of death in more than 1 million Asians](#)

2011 · N Engl J Med · 1,128 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 832 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	Global health 2050: the path to halving premature death by mid-century (2024)	George Washington University, Harvard University, University of California, San Francisco	United States	—
2	Health policy and public health implications of obesity in China (2021)	George Mason University, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, West China School of Public Health and West China Fourth Hospital, Sichuan University	China, 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
West China School of Public Health and West China Fourth Hospital, Sichuan University	China	—	1
Huazhong University of Science and Technology	China	SCImago #25 · THE =176 · QS 319	1
Xi'an Jiaotong University	China	SCImago #58 · THE 201–250 · QS 305	1
George Washington University	United States	SCImago #832 · THE 201–250 · QS =358	1
University of California, San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1
George Mason University	United States	SCImago #1399 · THE 401–500 · QS 951-1000	1
Harvard University	United States	SCImago #4 · THE =5 · QS 5	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.

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	Association between body-mass index and risk of death in more than 1 million Asians	2	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)