

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Colin M Beale

University of York

[Google Scholar profile](#)

Generated 2026-05-22 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

5 Citing papers mapped	5 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	48 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.

60.0% independent of 5 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	3
Self-citation	0
Co-author	2
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 foundational standards for distribution models in biodiversity assessments, a seminal contribution published in Science Advances that has garnered over 1,200 citations.

The researcher's primary contribution involves establishing rigorous standards for distribution models used in biodiversity assessments. This work is anchored by a seminal 2019 paper published in Science Advances, which serves as the cornerstone of this research line. No follow-up papers by the researcher were provided, indicating this single publication stands as the definitive output for this specific contribution.

This line of work appears to address a critical need for methodological consistency and reliability in ecological modeling. By proposing standardized frameworks, the researcher likely aimed to resolve ambiguities in how biodiversity data is interpreted and modeled, offering a unified approach that enhances the reproducibility and accuracy of scientific assessments in the field.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,255, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the scientific community. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad impact beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

[Standards for distribution models in biodiversity assessments](#)

2019 · Science Advances · 1,255 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 938 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Environmental Science papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Species distribution models rarely predict the biology of real populations (2022)	North Carolina State University, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, University of Lethbridge	Canada, United Kingdom, United States	—
2	Bending the curve of terrestrial biodiversity needs an integrated strategy (2020)	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research	Germany	—
3	Predictive performance of presence-only species distribution models: a benchmark study with reproducible code (2021)	University of Melbourne	Australia	—

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
Universidad de Costa Rica	Costa Rica	SCImago #4029 · THE 1501+ · QS =499	1
Uppsala University	Sweden	SCImago #349 · THE 128 · QS 93	1
North Carolina State University	United States	SCImago #484 · THE 301–350 · QS =272	1
International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis	Austria	SCImago #2681	1
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin	Germany	SCImago #816 · QS 130	1
Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research	Germany	SCImago #2238	1
University of Melbourne	Australia	SCImago #72 · THE 37 · QS 19	1
American Museum of Natural History	United States	SCImago #2740	1
City College of New York, City University of New York	United States	—	1
Innland County Council, Hadeland Videregående Skole	Norway	—	1
University of California-Merced	United States	SCImago #1812 · THE 401–500	1
University of Lethbridge	Canada	SCImago #5889 · THE 1501+	1
Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	United Kingdom	SCImago #2948	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Germany	2
United States	2
Costa Rica	1
Australia	1
Sweden	1
United Kingdom	1
Norway	1
Canada	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.

2020  2

2021  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	Standards for distribution models in biodiversity assessments	3	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)