Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Maytal Dahan

Texas Advanced Computing Center

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

47	50	53	17
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 3 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	3
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 advanced high-performance computing infrastructure by publishing a seminal work on XSEDE that significantly accelerated scientific discovery, evidenced by extensive independent scholarly uptake.

The researcher's contribution centers on the advancement of high-performance computing infrastructure, specifically through the publication of the core paper 'XSEDE: Accelerating Scientific Discovery' in 2014. This work appears to address the critical need for efficient computational resources in scientific research, establishing a foundational framework for leveraging large-scale computing systems. The titles suggest a focus on optimizing access and utility for diverse scientific communities.

This line of work appears to have filled a significant gap in the dissemination and utilization of supercomputing resources. By focusing on the XSEDE initiative, the researcher likely provided essential insights into how such infrastructure can be effectively managed and deployed to enhance research productivity. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single publication served as a comprehensive and definitive statement on the topic at the time.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count, which reflects broad recognition within the scientific community. Notably, the citation analysis reveals that all classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network. This high degree of independent uptake demonstrates the work's wide-reaching impact and its role as a key reference in the field of computational science infrastructure.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

XSEDE: Accelerating Scientific Discovery

2014 · Computing in Science & Engineering · 3,792 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,441 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2014 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and collaborative biomedical analyses: 2018 update (2018)	Albert-Ludwigs-University, Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg, Cleveland Clinic	France, Germany, Netherlands	Methodology
2	I-TASSER-MTD: a deep-learning-based platform for multi-domain protein structure and function prediction (2022)	University of Michigan, Zhejiang University of Technology	China, United States	—
3	iDEP: an integrated web application for differential expression and pathway analysis of RNA-Seq data (2018)	South Dakota State University	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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and collaborative biomedical analyses: 2018 update

"Specifically, Galaxy Main is now configured to take advantage of the XSEDE infrastructure (8) that includes Bridges and Stampede resources as well as the Jetstream cloud (9)."

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	2
South Dakota State University	United States	SCImago #3569	2
Institut Curie, PSL Research University	France	—	1
Penn State University	United States	—	1
Erasmus Medical Center	Netherlands	SCImago #340	1
Oregon Health and Science University	United States	SCImago #689 · THE 351–400	1
Earlham Institute	United Kingdom	—	1
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	1
University of Freiburg	Germany	THE =138	1
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	1
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	1
Zhejiang University of Technology	China	SCImago #455 · THE 501–600	1
Johns Hopkins University	United States	SCImago #33 · THE 16 · QS 24	1
University of Northern Iowa	United States	SCImago #8943	1
Albert-Ludwigs-University	Germany	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	9
China	1
France	1
Germany	1
Netherlands	1
United Kingdom	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	XSEDE: Accelerating Scientific Discovery	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)