Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Maxime Lenormand

Research Scientist - TETIS (INRAE)

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

2	2	1	28
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.

50.0% independent of 2 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	1
Self-citation	1
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

0 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

Automated review flag

Self-citations are 50.0% of classified citing papers — above the level at which AAO adjudicators routinely question citation evidence. The AAO faults petitioners who do not **disclose and net out** self-citations (it does not set a numeric cap). Present the per-article independent counts in §C and state the netting method.

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 pioneered the use of mobile phone data to analyze urban spatial structure, establishing a foundational methodology for data-driven city science.

CLAIM: The researcher's core contribution is the development of a framework for deriving the spatial structure of cities from mobile phone data, as demonstrated in the 2014 paper published in Scientific Reports. This work stands as a seminal piece in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in this specific line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests a novel methodological shift, leveraging large-scale digital footprints to understand urban morphology. By focusing on mobile phone data, the work appears to address the challenge of capturing dynamic, real-time spatial patterns that traditional static datasets might miss, offering a new lens for urban analysis.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 571 citations, the paper is highly influential, indicating broad adoption of its methods or findings. The citation analysis reveals that 50% of the citing papers come from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has resonated beyond the author's immediate circle and has been integrated into the broader scientific discourse on urban data science.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

From mobile phone data to the spatial structure of cities

2014 · Sci Rep. · 571 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 452 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2014 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Unravelling the spatial directionality of urban mobility (2024)	Beijing Jiaotong University, Peking University, Xuchang University	China	—

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
Commissariat à l'énergie atomique et aux énergies alternatives	France	SCImago #601	1
IFISC (Institute for Cross-Disciplinary Physics and Complex Systems)	Spain	—	1
University of Rochester	United States	SCImago #524 · THE 127 · QS 236	1
University of Bristol	United Kingdom	SCImago #478 · THE =80 · QS 51	1
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique	France	SCImago #3	1
Florida Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #6105 · THE 1001–1200	1
Irstea	France	—	1
Beijing Jiaotong University	China	SCImago #753 · QS 851-900	1
Xuchang University	China	SCImago #6013	1
Peking University	China	SCImago #11 · THE 13 · QS 14	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
China	1
France	1
Spain	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	From mobile phone data to the spatial structure of cities	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)