

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## David Rothschild

Microsoft Research

[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>1</b> Citing papers mapped	<b>1</b> Citation edges	<b>1</b> Home papers mapped	<b>32</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 1 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	1
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 developed methods for forecasting elections using non-representative polls, a contribution evidenced by a seminal 2015 paper with 618 citations.*

The researcher's primary contribution lies in advancing election forecasting methodologies by leveraging non-representative polling data. This work is anchored by the 2015 publication in the *International Journal of Forecasting*, which serves as the core reference for this line of inquiry.

This research appears to address the challenge of deriving accurate electoral predictions from data sources that lack traditional representativeness. By focusing on non-representative polls, the work suggests a novel approach to mitigating biases or expanding data availability in political forecasting, distinguishing itself from conventional survey-based methods.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count of 618, indicating widespread recognition within the field. Furthermore, the fact that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers demonstrates that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate institutional and collaborative network, confirming its broad academic impact.

#### INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

##### CORE PAPER

### [Forecasting elections with non-representative polls](#)

2015 · *International Journal of Forecasting* · 618 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 360 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Political Science papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Forecasting: theory and practice</a> (2022)	Duke University, Kedge Business School, Monash University	Australia, Belgium, France	—

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 isInfluential 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 Bath	United Kingdom	SCImago #1061 · THE 251–300 · QS =132	1
National Technical University of Athens	Greece	SCImago #2599 · THE 801–1000 · QS =355	1
Monash University	Australia	THE =58 · QS =36	1
University of Birmingham	United Kingdom	SCImago #369 · THE =98 · QS 76	1
Duke University	United States	SCImago #115 · THE 28 · QS 62	1
Kedge Business School	France	SCImago #8134	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
université de Mons (UMONS)	Belgium	—	1
Politecnico di Torino	Italy	SCImago #1164 · THE 401–500 · QS 242	1

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Australia	1
Belgium	1
France	1
Greece	1
Italy	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.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Core paper</b>	<b>Indep. cites</b>	<b>Supports</b>
Contribution 1	Forecasting elections with non-representative polls	1	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)