Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Liangfang Zhang

Joan and Irwin Jacobs Chancellor Professor, University of California San Diego

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

7	7	2	137
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 7 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
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 published a highly cited 2008 review synthesizing therapeutic applications and developments of nanoparticles in medicine, establishing a foundational reference for the field.

The researcher's contribution centers on a seminal 2008 paper titled 'Nanoparticles in medicine: therapeutic applications and developments,' published in Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. This work serves as the core anchor for this line of research, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author identified in the provided data.

This publication appears to address the need for a comprehensive synthesis of emerging nanoparticle therapies during a period of rapid development. By consolidating therapeutic applications and recent developments, the work likely provided a critical overview that helped define the scope and potential of nanomedicine for clinicians and researchers at the time.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 3655, indicating widespread uptake and influence. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting the work has served as a trusted, foundational reference across the broader scientific community rather than within a single collaborative group.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

CORE PAPER

Nanoparticles in medicine: therapeutic applications and developments

2008 · Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics · 3,655 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,520 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	Nano based drug delivery systems: recent developments and future prospects (2018)	Centro de Investigaciones en Óptica, Dongguk University, Dongguk University-Seoul	Brazil, India, Malaysia	—
2	Nanomaterials for cancer therapy: current progress and perspectives (2021)	The Hormel Institute, University of Minnesota, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University	China, United States	—
3	Nanoparticles for Cancer Therapy: Current Progress and Challenges (2021)	GenLab Biosolutions Private Limited, Poznań University of Medical Sciences	India, Poland	—
4	ZnO size and shape effect on antibacterial activity and cytotoxicity profile (2022)	Adam Mickiewicz University	Poland	—
5	Principles of nanoparticle design for overcoming biological barriers to drug delivery (2015)	Houston Methodist Research Institute	United States	—
6	Nanoparticle-Based Medicines: A Review of FDA-Approved Materials and Clinical Trials to Date (2016)	ARC Centre of Excellence in Convergent Bio-Nano Science and Technology, Monash University, University of Queensland	Australia	—

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 developed a biomimetic drug delivery platform using erythrocyte membrane-camouflaged polymeric nanoparticles, establishing a seminal approach in nanomedicine.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a biomimetic delivery platform utilizing erythrocyte membrane-camouflaged polymeric nanoparticles, as detailed in a 2011 paper published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS). This work stands as a foundational piece in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher listed in this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address the challenge of creating effective drug delivery systems by leveraging biological membranes to camouflage synthetic nanoparticles. The title suggests a novel strategy to enhance biocompatibility or targeting capabilities, distinguishing it from conventional polymeric nanoparticle designs through the integration of natural erythrocyte membranes.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count of 2,661, 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, demonstrating that the work has been adopted and built upon by the broader field rather than solely by the researcher's immediate collaborators.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Erythrocyte membrane-camouflaged polymeric nanoparticles as a biomimetic delivery platform

2011 · PNAS (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences) · 2,661 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,097 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Materials Science papers from 2011 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Passive, active and endogenous organ-targeted lipid and polymer nanoparticles for delivery of genetic drugs (2023)	The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center	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
Universiti Putra Malaysia	Malaysia	THE 501–600 · QS =134	1
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center	United States	SCImago #562	1
Poznań University of Medical Sciences	Poland	SCImago #2315 · THE 1201–1500	1
Monash University	Australia	THE =58 · QS =36	1
Adam Mickiewicz University	Poland	SCImago #2978	1
Dongguk University	South Korea	SCImago #1675 · QS =618	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Queensland	Australia	SCImago #126 · THE =80 · QS =42	1
Xiangya Hospital, Central South University	China	—	1
Dongguk University-Seoul	South Korea	—	1
Sao Paulo State University (UNESP)	Brazil	—	1
Escuela Nacional de Estudios Superiores, Unidad Leon, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)	Mexico	—	1
Centro de Investigaciones en Óptica	Mexico	SCImago #9232	1
São Paulo State University (UNESP)	Brazil	—	1
Motilal Nehru National Institute of Technology Allahabad	India	—	1
The Hormel Institute, University of Minnesota	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	3
India	2
Poland	2
Malaysia	1
Australia	1
South Korea	1
United Kingdom	1
Mexico	1
Brazil	1
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.

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	Nanoparticles in medicine: therapeutic applications and developments	6	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Erythrocyte membrane-camouflaged polymeric nanoparticles as a biomimetic delivery platform	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)