Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Suma Desu Bailis

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

11	11	5	6
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 11 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	11
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 identified a universal positivity bias in human language, establishing a foundational framework for understanding linguistic sentiment patterns through a highly cited seminal study.

The researcher's primary contribution centers on the identification of a universal positivity bias in human language, as detailed in the 2015 paper titled 'Human language reveals a universal positivity bias.' This work serves as the cornerstone of this specific line of inquiry, presenting a distinct claim about the inherent nature of linguistic expression across different contexts. The titles indicate a focus on broad, cross-linguistic or universal patterns rather than isolated case studies, suggesting an attempt to generalize findings about human communication tendencies.

This line of work appears to address a gap in understanding whether positive sentiment is a dominant feature of human language universally or merely a cultural artifact. By framing the finding as a 'universal' bias, the researcher challenges or complements existing theories that may have viewed linguistic positivity as variable or context-dependent. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher in this dataset suggests that the 2015 publication stands as a definitive, self-contained contribution to this specific theoretical question, rather than part of an ongoing iterative series by the author.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 550, indicating that the work has been widely recognized and utilized by the academic community. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, excluding the author, co-authors, or colleagues from the same institution. This high degree of independent uptake suggests that the findings have resonated beyond the researcher's immediate network, influencing broader scholarly discourse and serving as a reference point for diverse investigators in the field.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

Human language reveals a universal positivity bias

2015 · 550 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 392 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Linguistics papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	An overview of online fake news: Characterization, detection, and discussion (2020)	University of New Brunswick	Canada	—
2	Sentiment Analysis in Tourism: Capitalizing on Big Data (2017)	Griffith University	Australia	—
3	Can Artificial Intelligence Improve Gender Equality? Evidence from a Natural Experiment (2026)	Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Monash University, University of Hong Kong	Australia, China, Hong Kong	—

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 developed a chemical spray pyrolysis method for depositing and characterizing p-type CuCr1–xMgxO2 transparent oxide semiconductor thin films.

The researcher's contribution centers on the development of a chemical spray pyrolysis deposition technique for p-type CuCr1–xMgxO2 transparent oxide semiconductor thin films, as detailed in their 2008 core paper. This work appears to address the need for accessible methods to fabricate and characterize specific p-type transparent conductive oxides.

The originality of this line of work lies in its focus on the synthesis and characterization of CuCr1–xMgxO2 films via spray pyrolysis. The titles suggest a methodological contribution to the field of transparent oxide semiconductors, providing a pathway for creating p-type materials that complement existing n-type counterparts.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its citation record. With 89 citations, the paper has been recognized by the broader scientific community. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate institution and collaboration network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Chemical spray pyrolysis deposition and characterization of p-type CuCr1– xMgxO2 transparent oxide semiconductor thin films

2008 · 89 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Highly Conductive and Visibly Transparent p-Type CuCrO (2022)	Deakin University, RMIT University	Australia	—

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 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher demonstrated that Zipf's law applies to phrases rather than individual words, challenging traditional assumptions about linguistic frequency distributions.

CLAIM: The researcher's core contribution is the 2015 paper titled 'Zipf's law holds for phrases, not words,' which posits that phrase-level units, rather than single words, adhere to Zipf's distributional laws.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address a fundamental gap in computational linguistics by shifting the analytical unit from words to phrases. The title suggests a corrective or novel perspective on how frequency laws manifest in natural language, moving beyond established word-centric models.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 96 citations, the paper has garnered substantial attention. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the finding has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community outside the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6 **· 1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Zipf's law holds for phrases, not words

2015 · 96 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 72 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Computer Science papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Sentiment and structure in word co-occurrence networks on Twitter (2022)	—	—	—
2	Storywrangler: A massive exploratorium for sociolinguistic, cultural, socioeconomic, and political timelines using Twitter. (2021)	MassMutual, University of Vermont	United States	—
3	Zipf's law revisited: Spoken dialog, linguistic units, parameters, and the principle of least effort. (2023)	Tilburg University	Netherlands	—
4	More Than Words: The Role of Multiword Sequences in Language Learning and Use. (2017)	Cornell University, Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Israel, United States	—
5	UCPhrase (2021)	University of California, San Diego, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	**Influential**
6	Meaningfulness Beats Frequency in Multiword Chunk Processing. (2020)	Cornell University, Oracle Cloud Infrastructure, University of Iowa	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
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	2
Deakin University	Australia	SCImago #607 · THE 201–250 · QS =207	1
RMIT University	Australia	THE 251–300 · QS 125	1
University of California, San Diego	United States	SCImago #120 · THE 47 · QS 66	1
MassMutual	United States	—	1
University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	SCImago #195 · THE 33 · QS 11	1
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	SCImago #206 · THE =41	1
University of Michigan	United States	SCImago #43 · THE 23 · QS 45	1
Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Israel	SCImago #1097 · THE 251–300 · QS =240	1
Monash University	Australia	THE =58 · QS =36	1
University of Southern California	United States	SCImago #192 · THE =73 · QS 146	1
Griffith University	Australia	SCImago #869 · THE 251–300 · QS 268	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Oracle Cloud Infrastructure	—	—	1
University of New Brunswick	Canada	SCImago #3117 · QS =622	1
University of Iowa	United States	SCImago #615 · THE 301–350 · QS =530	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	5
Australia	3
China	1
Israel	1
Netherlands	1
Hong Kong	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.

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	Human language reveals a universal positivity bias	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Chemical spray pyrolysis deposition and characterization of p-type CuCr1− xMgxO2 transparent oxide semiconductor thin films	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	Zipf's law holds for phrases, not words	6	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)