

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Giuseppe Argenziano

Full Professor of Dermatology, University of Campania, Naples, Italy

[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

|                                  |                            |                                |                            |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>6</b><br>Citing papers mapped | <b>6</b><br>Citation edges | <b>1</b><br>Home papers mapped | <b>106</b><br>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.

**50.0% independent** of 6 classified citing papers

| Citation type    | Count |
|------------------|-------|
| Independent      | 3     |
| Self-citation    | 0     |
| Co-author        | 3     |
| 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 foundational consensus framework for dermoscopic evaluation of pigmented skin lesions, significantly standardizing diagnostic criteria in dermatology.*

The researcher’s primary contribution rests on the 2003 publication in the Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, which documents the results of an Internet-based consensus meeting regarding the dermoscopy of pigmented skin lesions. This work stands as a singular, seminal effort without subsequent follow-up papers by the same author in this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address the need for standardized diagnostic protocols in dermatology. By facilitating a consensus meeting via the Internet, the researcher likely aimed to harmonize diverse clinical perspectives and establish unified criteria for interpreting dermoscopic images, thereby reducing diagnostic variability.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,738, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, the fact that 50% of classified citations originate from independent researchers suggests that the work has been validated and utilized by the broader scientific community beyond the author’s immediate circle.

### INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

#### CORE PAPER

#### [Dermoscopy of pigmented skin lesions: results of a consensus meeting via the Internet](#)

2003 · Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology · 1,738 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,192 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2003 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper   | Citing institution(s)                                       | Country              | S2 |
|-----|--|---|----------------------|----|
| 1   | <a href="#">A review of deep learning-based multiple-lesion recognition from medical images: classification, detection and segmentation</a> (2023)   | Northeastern University, Stevens Institute of Technology    | China, United States | —  |
| 2   | <a href="#">Advances in melanoma: epidemiology, diagnosis, and prognosis</a> (2023)  | Temple University Hospital, Thomas Jefferson University     | United States        | —  |
| 3   | <a href="#">Skin Lesion Analysis toward Melanoma Detection: A Challenge at the International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI) 2016, hosted by the International Skin Imaging Collaboration (ISIC)</a> (2016) | Emory University, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, Kitware | 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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

## D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

### Top citing institutions

| Institution                            | Country       | World ranking | Citing papers |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center | United States | SCImago #210  | 3             |
| Kitware                                | United States | —             | 3             |

| Institution  | Country       | World ranking                         | Citing papers |
|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| Hospital Clínic Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, IDIBAPS | Spain         | —                                     | 2             |
| Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya                         | Spain         | SCImago #624 · THE 601–800            | 2             |
| Mayo Clinic  | United States | SCImago #88                           | 1             |
| Weill Cornell Medical College                                | United States | —                                     | 1             |
| University of Athens   | Greece        | SCImago #617                          | 1             |
| Missouri University of Science and Technology                | United States | SCImago #3048 · THE 501–600 · QS =628 | 1             |
| Rabin Medical Center   | Israel        | SCImago #2059                         | 1             |
| Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center                       | United States | SCImago #210                          | 1             |
| IBM T. J. Watson Research Center                             | United States | —                                     | 1             |
| IBM  | United States | —                                     | 1             |
| Stevens Institute of Technology                              | United States | SCImago #1775 · THE 501–600 · QS =673 | 1             |
| Medical University of Vienna                                 | Austria       | SCImago #668 · THE =181               | 1             |
| Temple University Hospital                                   | United States | —                                     | 1             |

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

| Country       | Citing papers |
|---------------|---------------|
| United States | 6             |
| Spain         | 3             |
| China         | 1             |
| Australia     | 1             |
| Israel        | 1             |
| Greece        | 1             |
| Austria       | 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.

2023  2

## 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 | Dermoscopy of pigmented skin lesions: results of a consensus meeting via the Internet | 3            | Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned) |