Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Marjanka K Schmidt

Netherlands 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

13	13	2	94
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.

92.3% independent of 13 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	12
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
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 conducted a large-scale collaborative analysis linking breast cancer immunohistochemical subtypes to patient survival outcomes, establishing a foundational framework for subtype-specific prognostic assessment.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is a seminal 2010 study published in PLoS Medicine that analyzed data from over 10,000 cases across 12 studies to investigate the relationship between breast cancer subtypes and survival. This work stands as a core reference in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher listed in this specific line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: The titles indicate that this work addressed a critical need for standardized subtyping using immunohistochemistry to clarify prognostic differences. By aggregating data from multiple studies, the researcher appears to have provided a robust, large-scale validation of how specific subtypes correlate with short and long-term survival, moving beyond smaller, isolated analyses.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has been cited 1,377 times, indicating substantial impact. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than just the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

Subtyping of breast cancer by immunohistochemistry to investigate a relationship between subtype and short and long term survival: a collaborative analysis of data for 10,159 cases from 12 studies

2010 · PLoS Med · 1,377 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,105 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	UALCAN: A Portal for Facilitating Tumor Subgroup Gene Expression and Survival Analyses (2017)	University of Alabama at Birmingham	United States	—
2	MOGONET integrates multi-omics data using graph convolutional networks allowing patient classification and biomarker identification (2021)	Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana University School of Medicine, Purdue University	United States	—
3	Breast cancer statistics, 2015: Convergence of incidence rates between black and white women (2016)	American Cancer Society, Emory University School of Medicine	United States	—
4	Strategies for subtypes—dealing with the diversity of breast cancer: highlights of the St Gallen International Expert Consensus on the Primary Therapy of Early Breast Cancer 2011 (2011)	Emory University School of Medicine, European Institute of Oncology, International Breast Cancer Study Group and University of Sydney	Australia, Italy, 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.

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher identified 65 new breast cancer risk loci through association analysis, establishing a foundational genetic map that has been widely adopted by independent scientists.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the identification of 65 new breast cancer risk loci, as detailed in the 2017 paper titled 'Association analysis identifies 65 new breast cancer risk loci.' This work stands as a singular, high-impact achievement in the field.

ORIGINALITY: This line of work appears to address the critical need for expanded genetic understanding of breast cancer susceptibility. By leveraging association analysis, the researcher uncovered a substantial number of previously unknown risk loci, significantly broadening the known genetic landscape of the disease without reliance on subsequent follow-up publications by the same author.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work demonstrates substantial independent impact, evidenced by 1,726 citations. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the scientific community broadly relies on these findings as a standard reference, rather than the work being driven by self-citation or institutional collaboration.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8

CORE PAPER

Association analysis identifies 65 new breast cancer risk loci

2017 · 1,726 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,310 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2017 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The NHGRI-EBI GWAS Catalog of published genome-wide association studies, targeted arrays and summary statistics 2019 (2019)	European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European Bioinformatics Institute, National Human Genome Research Institute	United Kingdom, United States	—
2	Reading Mendelian randomisation studies: a guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians (2018)	University of Bristol, University of Oxford	United Kingdom	—
3	Deciphering breast cancer: from biology to the clinic (2023)	The Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research, University of Auckland	Australia, New Zealand	—
4	The personal and clinical utility of polygenic risk scores. (2018)	Scripps Health, The Scripps Research Institute	United States	—
5	The GTEx Consortium atlas of genetic regulatory effects across human tissues. (2020)	The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard	United States	—
6	Cancer health disparities in racial/ethnic minorities in the United States (2020)	Beckman Research Institute of City of Hope, Boston University, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School	Argentina, Puerto Rico, United States	—
7	Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and continuous shrinkage priors (2019)	Massachusetts General Hospital, Texas A&M University	United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
8	LDpred2: better, faster, stronger (2021)	Aarhus University, Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Inria, CNRS, Grenoble INP	Denmark, France	—

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
European Institute of Oncology	Italy	SCImago #1281	2
Emory University School of Medicine	United States	—	2
City of Hope	United States	SCImago #640	2
American Cancer Society	United States	SCImago #14	2
Washington University School of Medicine	United States	—	1
German Cancer Research Center	Germany	—	1
University of Oslo	Norway	SCImago #425 · THE =113 · QS =119	1
University of Auckland	New Zealand	SCImago #618 · THE =156 · QS 65	1
Purdue University	United States	SCImago #255 · QS =88	1
University of California Davis	United States	SCImago #194 · THE 64 · QS =114	1
City of Hope National Medical Center	United States	SCImago #640	1
University of Leicester	United Kingdom	SCImago #1023 · THE =192 · QS 326	1
Indiana University School of Medicine	United States	—	1
The Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research	Australia	SCImago #580	1
University of California San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	10
Australia	3
United Kingdom	3
Italy	2
France	2
Denmark	2
Norway	1
Puerto Rico	1

Country	Citing papers
Russia	1
Spain	1
Sweden	1
Netherlands	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	Subtyping of breast cancer by immunohistochemistry to investigate a relationship between subtype and short and long term survival: a collaborative analysis of data for 10,159 cases from 12 studies	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Association analysis identifies 65 new breast cancer risk loci	8	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)