Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Stephanie Kovalchik

Zelus Analytics

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

1	1	1	36
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 1 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	1
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 developed a risk-stratified framework for low-dose CT lung cancer screening, published in NEJM, which has garnered significant independent scholarly attention.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a methodology for targeting low-dose CT screening based on the specific risk of lung-cancer death, as detailed in a 2013 paper published in The New England Journal of Medicine.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the critical need for precision in screening protocols by moving beyond broad eligibility criteria. The title suggests a novel approach to stratifying patients according to their individual risk of mortality from lung cancer, thereby optimizing the allocation of screening resources.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated 675 citations, indicating substantial uptake within the medical community. Notably, the available citation data shows that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad impact and acceptance beyond the researcher's immediate institutional circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Targeting of Low-Dose CT Screening According to the Risk of Lung-Cancer Death

2013 · The New England Journal of Medicine · 675 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 552 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2013 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Air Pollution and Lung Cancer: A Review by International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer Early Detection and Screening Committee (2023)	All India Institute of Medical Sciences, British Columbia Cancer Agency and The University of British Columbia, British Columbia Cancer Research Institute	Canada, China, Hungary	—

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).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Hong Kong	China	SCImago #195 · THE 33 · QS 11	1
All India Institute of Medical Sciences	India	SCImago #1342	1
Stony Brook University	United States	SCImago #993 · THE 301–350	1
Fudan University	China	SCImago #46 · THE 36 · QS 30	1
University of Virginia	United States	SCImago #451 · THE =166 · QS 275	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Brock University	Canada	SCImago #6013 · THE 1201–1500 · QS 1201-1400	1
Early Cancer Detection Consultant	—	—	1
The International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer	United States	—	1
National Korányi Institute for Pulmonology	Hungary	—	1
Rescue Lung Society	United States	—	1
British Columbia Cancer Research Institute	Canada	—	1
Zhongshan Hospital Fudan University	China	—	1
British Columbia Cancer Agency and The University of British Columbia	Canada	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Canada	1
China	1
Hungary	1
India	1
United States	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.

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	Targeting of Low-Dose CT Screening According to the Risk of Lung-Cancer Death	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)