

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Werner J. Reinartz

Professor of Marketing, Vice Rector at the Univ. of Cologne

[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

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.

80.0% independent of 5 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	4
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
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 empirically established the profitability of long-life customers in noncontractual settings, providing foundational evidence for customer relationship management strategies.

CLAIM: The researcher’s seminal contribution is the empirical investigation of customer profitability in noncontractual environments, anchored by the 2000 Journal of Marketing article titled ‘On the Profitability of Long-Life Customers in a Noncontractual Setting.’

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address a critical gap by quantifying value in relationships lacking formal contracts. The titles indicate a focus on deriving marketing implications from empirical data, suggesting a novel approach to assessing long-term customer worth without contractual enforcement.

SIGNIFICANCE: With nearly 2,400 citations, the paper is highly influential. Analysis of citing literature reveals that 80% of references come from independent researchers, demonstrating broad adoption across the field and confirming the work’s status as a standard reference for understanding customer lifetime value.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

[On the Profitability of Long-Life Customers in a Noncontractual Setting: An Empirical Investigation and Implications for Marketing](#)

2000 · Journal of Marketing · 2,398 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,448 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 2000 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Understanding Customer Experience Throughout the Customer Journey (2016)	Boston College, University of Groningen	Netherlands, United States	—
2	Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research directions (2010)	Boston College, Freie Universität, Rice University	Germany, Netherlands, United States	—
3	Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer (2010)	Vanderbilt University	United States	—
4	Return on marketing: Using customer equity to focus marketing strategy (2004)	Boston College, University of Maryland, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	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
Boston College	United States	SCImago #3099 · THE 251–300 · QS =526	3
University of Groningen	Netherlands	SCImago #232 · THE 82 · QS =147	2
Rice University	United States	SCImago #818 · THE =103 · QS =119	1
Vanderbilt University	United States	SCImago #613 · THE =92 · QS 250	1
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	United States	THE 78 · QS =140	1
University of Cologne	Germany	SCImago #1225 · THE =164 · QS =272	1
University of Maryland	United States	—	1
Freie Universität	—	—	1
TNS Infratest GmbH	—	—	1
University of Münster	Germany	SCImago #881 · THE =195 · QS =350	1
Georgia State University	United States	SCImago #1626 · THE 501–600 · QS 781-790	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	5
Germany	2
Netherlands	2

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.

2010		2
2016		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	On the Profitability of Long-Life Customers in a Noncontractual Setting: An Empirical Investigation and Implications for Marketing	4	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)