Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Kelly Gaither

Unknown affiliation

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

3	3	1	21
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 robust computational resources to support complex scientific inquiries, positioning the XSEDE initiative as a pivotal enabler of research progress. The titles suggest a focus on systemic acceleration rather than isolated algorithmic improvements, indicating a broad infrastructural impact.

The originality of this line of work lies in its apparent role in defining or promoting the utility of shared supercomputing resources for diverse scientific communities. By focusing on the acceleration of discovery, the researcher likely highlighted how accessible high-performance computing could overcome traditional bottlenecks in data-intensive fields. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher in this specific dataset suggests that the core paper itself served as a definitive statement on the topic, establishing a foundational reference point for the field.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count, which indicates widespread recognition and utility within the scientific community. Furthermore, the fact that all classified citing papers originate from independent researchers demonstrates that the work has resonated beyond the researcher's immediate circle, influencing peers and scholars across different institutions. This broad, independent uptake confirms the work's status as a seminal reference in the domain of scientific computing infrastructure.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

XSEDE: Accelerating Scientific Discovery

2014 · Computing in Science & Engineering · 3,783 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	—
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 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
Cleveland Clinic	United States	SCImago #306	1
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg	Germany	—	1
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
University of Freiburg	Germany	THE =138	1
South Dakota State University	United States	SCImago #3569	1
University of Michigan	United States	SCImago #43 · THE 23 · QS 45	1
Zhejiang University of Technology	China	SCImago #455 · THE 501–600	1
Johns Hopkins University	United States	SCImago #33 · THE 16 · QS 24	1
Albert-Ludwigs-University	Germany	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	3
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).

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)