Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Andrea Tricco

Scientist, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute of St. Michael's Hospital

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

895	940	102	109
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.

88.9% independent of 9 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	8
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
Same-institution	0

5 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 the PRISMA-ScR framework, providing a standardized checklist and explanation that significantly advanced methodological rigor in scoping reviews.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of the PRISMA-ScR framework, detailed in the 2018 paper 'PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation' published in Annals of Internal Medicine. This work stands as a seminal core contribution without direct follow-up papers by the same author in this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address a critical methodological gap by extending established reporting guidelines to the specific context of scoping reviews. The titles indicate a focus on standardization through a checklist and explanatory guidance, suggesting an effort to improve transparency and consistency in this distinct type of evidence synthesis.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating over 42,000 citations. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating broad adoption across the global scientific community rather than isolated institutional use.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2 **· 1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation

2018 · Annals of Internal Medicine · 42,982 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 28,477 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2018 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review (2024)	Central Queensland University, CQUniversity	Australia	Background
2	A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour	Halmstad University, Harvard Medical School, The University of Queensland	Australia, Sweden, United Kingdom	**Methodology**

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 A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour

"Overcoming resistance to change and solving various challenges, including those of an ethical and administrative nature, was identified as pivotal for successful AIHEd integration (Sourani, 2019)."

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher established the PRISMA 2020 statement, a widely adopted updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews, significantly standardizing transparency and completeness in medical research synthesis.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of the PRISMA 2020 statement, published in 2021 across multiple high-impact journals including BMJ and PLOS Medicine. This work serves as the foundational core of this line of research, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in the provided data, indicating the statement itself stands as a definitive, self-contained contribution to the field.

This work appears to address the critical need for updated standards in reporting systematic reviews. By providing an updated guideline, the researcher likely aimed to resolve ambiguities or gaps in previous reporting frameworks, ensuring that systematic reviews are conducted and reported with greater rigor, transparency, and consistency for the global scientific community.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with over 156,000 citations recorded. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, rather than the author's own network. This high degree of independent adoption underscores the work's status as a seminal, field-defining standard that has been widely integrated into the practice of evidence-based medicine.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews

2021 · BMJ, PLOS Medicine, Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, Systematic Reviews, and the International Journal of Surgery · 156,289 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 15,986 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2021 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Global Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases and Risks, 1990-2022 (2023)	Bayero University Kano, Cairo University, Cleveland Clinic	Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran	—
2	Artificial intelligence in teaching and teacher professional development: A systematic review	—	—	—
3	Burden of disease scenarios for 204 countries and territories, 2022–2050: a forecasting analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021 (2024)	Addis Ababa University, Ain Shams University, Aleta Wondo Hospital	Australia, Egypt, Ethiopia	—

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).

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established updated methodological guidance for scoping reviews, a seminal framework that has become a standard reference in evidence synthesis.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews, published in JBI Evidence Synthesis in 2020. This work serves as the foundational core of 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 refined standards in evidence synthesis methodology. By offering updated guidance, the work suggests a response to evolving best practices or gaps in existing protocols for conducting scoping reviews, positioning itself as a key resource for researchers in this field.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 8,032. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers indicates that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating broad adoption and influence across the global academic community beyond the researcher's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews

2020 · JBI Evidence Synthesis · 8,437 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 5,243 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2020 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Steps for Conducting a Scoping Review (2022)	McGill University	Canada	—
2	A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour	Halmstad University, Harvard Medical School, The University of Queensland	Australia, Sweden, United Kingdom	—
3	The impact of ChatGPT on higher education	Galgotias University, Higher Colleges of Technology, Zayed University	India, United Arab Emirates	Background
4	A scoping review of artificial intelligence in medical education: BEME Guide No. 84 (2024)	Baylor College of Medicine, Blackpool Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Maastricht University	Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States	**Methodology**

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 A scoping review of artificial intelligence in medical education: BEME Guide No. 84

"We also conformed to the PRISMA-ScR reporting standards (Tricco et al. 2018), drawing on support from Peters et al. (2020, 2022) to offset the absence of specialized reporting standards for scoping reviews in health professions education."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
McMaster University	Canada	SCImago #465 · THE =116 · QS =173	3
Mayo Clinic	United States	SCImago #88	3
University of Glasgow	United Kingdom	SCImago #351 · THE 84 · QS 79	3
Harvard Medical School	United States	SCImago #12	3
Harvard University	United States	SCImago #4 · THE =5 · QS 5	2
University of California, Los Angeles	United States	SCImago #70 · THE =18 · QS 46	2
Central Queensland University	Australia	SCImago #4119 · THE 401–500 · QS =499	2
Queen Mary University of London	United Kingdom	SCImago #416 · THE =134 · QS =110	2

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Tehran University of Medical Sciences	Iran	SCImago #701 · THE 501–600	2
Jimma University	Ethiopia	SCImago #5519	2
University of Pennsylvania	United States	SCImago #52 · THE 14 · QS 15	2
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	2
Maastricht University	Netherlands	SCImago #783 · THE =131 · QS 239	2
University of Exeter	United Kingdom	SCImago #679 · THE =170 · QS =155	2
Ottawa Hospital Research Institute	Canada	SCImago #2914	2

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	18
United Kingdom	11
Canada	11
Australia	9
China	9
Indonesia	6
India	4
Germany	4
Egypt	3
Nigeria	3
Singapore	2
Iran	2

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).

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	PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation	2	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)