

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Henry Farrell

Johns Hopkins SAIS

[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

4	4	2	49
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 4 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	4
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 advanced the understanding of political polarization by empirically examining the relationship between blog readership, participation, and self-segregation in American politics.

The researcher's core contribution rests on the 2010 article 'Self-Segregation or Deliberation? Blog Readership, Participation, and Polarization in American Politics,' published in *Perspectives on Politics*. This work appears to address the critical question of whether online political engagement fosters deliberative exchange or reinforces ideological self-segregation. By focusing on blog readership and participation, the study likely provided early empirical evidence regarding the structural dynamics of digital political discourse during a period of rapid internet adoption. The title suggests a nuanced investigation into whether these platforms serve as echo chambers or spaces for cross-cutting exposure, a debate central to understanding modern political polarization. The significance of this line of work is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 611, indicating that it has become a foundational reference in the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the findings have been widely adopted and built upon by the broader academic community rather than remaining confined to the researcher's immediate circle. This high degree of independent uptake underscores the work's impact on shaping subsequent scholarship on media effects and political behavior.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

[Self-Segregation or Deliberation? Blog Readership, Participation, and Polarization in American Politics](#)

2010 · *Perspectives on Politics* · 611 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 331 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Political Science papers from 2010 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	How digital media drive affective polarization through partisan sorting (2022)	—	—	—

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 established a foundational framework for understanding the political consequences of the internet, as evidenced by a seminal, highly cited review article.

The researcher's primary contribution is the synthesis of knowledge regarding the internet's impact on politics, anchored by the 2012 article 'The Consequences of the Internet for Politics' published in the *Annual Review of Political Science*. This work serves as the core reference point for this line of inquiry.

This contribution appears to address the need for a comprehensive overview of how digital technologies reshape political processes. By publishing in a leading review journal, the researcher provided a structured analysis that likely consolidated emerging evidence and theoretical perspectives during a period of rapid technological change.

The significance of this work is demonstrated by its substantial citation count of 710, indicating widespread recognition within the field. Furthermore, the fact that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers suggests that the work has influenced scholars across different institutions, reinforcing its status as a widely accepted and impactful resource.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

The Consequences of the Internet for Politics

2012 · Annual Review of Political Science · 710 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 358 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Political Science papers from 2012 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Algorithmic media use and algorithm literacy: An integrative literature review (2025)	University of Mannheim	Germany	—
2	China's Strategic Censorship (2014)	University of San Francisco	United States	—
3	How Social Media Is Changing Conflict (2017)	American University	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
University of San Francisco	United States	SCImago #4982 · QS 1201-1400	1
University of Mannheim	Germany	SCImago #3577 · THE 201–250 · QS =416	1
American University	United States	SCImago #5287 · THE 601–800 · QS =587	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	2
Germany	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	Self-Segregation or Deliberation? Blog Readership, Participation, and Polarization in American Politics	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	The Consequences of the Internet for Politics	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)