

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Sundar Bharadwaj

Coca Cola Company Chair Professor of Marketing, University of Georgia

[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 Citing papers mapped	3 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	36 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 established a foundational model for marketing strategy making, providing a seminal framework that has significantly influenced subsequent academic inquiry in the field.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the development of a comprehensive model regarding the antecedents and consequences of marketing strategy making, as detailed in the 1999 article published in the Journal of Marketing.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the need for a structured theoretical framework to understand how marketing strategies are formulated and their resulting impacts. By proposing and testing a specific model, the researcher provided a novel lens for analyzing strategic decision-making processes in marketing, distinguishing this approach from prior descriptive studies.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has garnered substantial attention, with over 1,200 citations, indicating its enduring relevance and utility in the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community outside the researcher’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

[Antecedents and Consequences of Marketing Strategy Making: A Model and a Test](#)

1999 · Journal of Marketing · 1,267 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 717 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 1999 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Hybrid Offerings: How Manufacturing Firms Combine Goods and Services Successfully (2011)	HEC School of Management, University of Cologne	France, Germany	Background
2	Marketing agility: The concept, antecedents, and a research agenda (2021)	National University of Singapore, Singapore Management University, University of Connecticut	Singapore, United States	Background
3	The value relevance of digital marketing capabilities to firm performance (2022)	Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Mannheim	Germany, United Kingdom	—

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
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	United States	THE 78 · QS =140	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Singapore Management University	Singapore	SCImago #968 · QS =511	1
National University of Singapore	Singapore	SCImago #59 · THE 17 · QS 8	1
University of Mannheim	Germany	SCImago #3577 · THE 201–250 · QS =416	1
University of Cologne	Germany	SCImago #1225 · THE =164 · QS =272	1
University of Connecticut	United States	THE 351–400 · QS 534	1
HEC School of Management	France	—	1
Alliance Manchester Business School	United Kingdom	—	1
University of Illinois Chicago	United States	SCImago #593 · THE 201–250 · QS =334	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Germany	2
France	1
Singapore	1
United Kingdom	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	Antecedents and Consequences of Marketing Strategy Making: A Model and a Test	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)