

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Helen Christensen

Professor, Psychiatry and Mental Health, University of New South Wales

[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	166 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 established a seminal framework for multidisciplinary mental health research priorities during the COVID-19 pandemic, as evidenced by a highly cited 2020 Lancet Psychiatry paper.

The researcher's primary contribution is the articulation of critical research priorities for mental health science in the context of the global pandemic. This work is anchored by a 2020 publication in *The Lancet Psychiatry*, which serves as the foundational text for this line of inquiry.

This contribution appears to address the urgent need for coordinated, multidisciplinary action in mental health research during a public health crisis. By framing the issue as a call for action, the work likely filled a gap in strategic guidance for the scientific community, offering a structured approach to prioritizing mental health interventions and studies.

The significance of this work is demonstrated by its substantial citation count, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the field. Furthermore, the fact that all classified citations originate from independent researchers suggests that the framework has been adopted and utilized by a broad, external scientific community, rather than being limited to the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

[Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science](#)

2020 · *The Lancet Psychiatry* · 7,561 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 4,629 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2020 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis (2020)	Imperial College London, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens	Greece, United Kingdom	—
2	Effects of COVID-19 on College Students' Mental Health in the United States: Interview Survey Study (2020)	Texas A&M University	United States	—
3	Impact of COVID-19 and lockdown on mental health of children and adolescents: A narrative review with recommendations (2020)	KGMU, King George's Medical University	India	—
4	The psychological and mental impact of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) on medical staff and general public—A systematic review and meta-analysis. (2020)	96605 Army Hospital, The 965th Hospital of the Joint Logistic Support Force of the People's Liberation Army of China	China	—

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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens	Greece	SCImago #617 · THE 401–500 · QS 390	1
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	SCImago #63 · THE =3 · QS 6	1
Imperial College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #69 · THE 8 · QS 2	1
University of Manchester	United Kingdom	SCImago #196 · THE 56 · QS 35	1
National Centre for Social Research	United Kingdom	—	1
Texas A&M University	United States	THE =151 · QS 144	1
KGMU	India	—	1
King George's Medical University	India	—	1
Swansea University	United Kingdom	SCImago #1529 · THE 301–350 · QS 292	1
King's College London	United Kingdom	THE 38 · QS 31	1
The 965th Hospital of the Joint Logistic Support Force of the People's Liberation Army of China	China	—	1
96605 Army Hospital	China	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United Kingdom	2
China	1
Greece	1
India	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.

2020  5

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	Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science	4	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)