

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Linh Hoang Nguyen

Limited-term Lecturer, Purdue University

[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

<b>10</b> Citing papers mapped	<b>10</b> Citation edges	<b>3</b> Home papers mapped	<b>1</b> 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 2 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	2
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
Same-institution	0

8 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 developed a factor model-based evaluation to assess the efficacy of ability proxies in estimating the returns to schooling, addressing critical measurement challenges in labor economics.*

The researcher’s contribution centers on the 2024 publication, ‘The efficacy of ability proxies for estimating the returns to schooling: A factor model-based evaluation.’ This work appears to introduce a rigorous methodological framework for evaluating how well various proxies capture individual ability when calculating educational returns. By focusing on a factor model-based approach, the research addresses the persistent challenge of omitted variable bias in estimating the economic benefits of schooling, offering a refined tool for disentangling ability effects from educational attainment.

This line of work appears to address a significant gap in labor economics regarding the reliability of standard ability proxies. The title suggests a novel application of factor modeling to validate these proxies, providing a more robust statistical foundation for existing literature. As the core paper stands alone without follow-up publications by the same researcher in this dataset, it represents a distinct, self-contained methodological advancement that offers a clear, evaluative framework for peers.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its immediate uptake within the academic community. With 11 citations, the work has already attracted attention from independent researchers, indicating its relevance to ongoing debates in the field. Notably, 100% of the classified citations originate from independent scholars, suggesting that the methodology or findings have been adopted by peers outside the researcher’s immediate network to inform their own studies on educational returns and ability measurement.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

#### CORE PAPER

### [The efficacy of ability proxies for estimating the returns to schooling: A factor model-based evaluation](#)

2024 · Journal of Applied Econometrics 39 (1), 3-21, 2024 · 11 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">The influence of drivers and barriers on female consumers' in-store collaborative clothing consumption practices in an emerging market context</a> (2024)	University of Pretoria	South Africa	—
2	<a href="#">Three Essays on Applied Econometrics With Applications in Urban Economics</a> (2024)	University of Colorado Boulder	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 Pretoria	South Africa	SCImago #1629 · THE 501–600 · QS =362	1
University of Colorado Boulder	United States	SCImago #551 · THE 159 · QS 299	1

## Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
South Africa	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.

## 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.

2024  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.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Core paper</b>	<b>Indep. cites</b>	<b>Supports</b>
Contribution 1	The efficacy of ability proxies for estimating the returns to schooling: A factor model-based evaluation	2	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)