

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Adrian Payne

Professor of Marketing Emeritus

[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	1	64
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 established a foundational framework for co-creating brands by diagnosing and designing the relationship experience, a seminal contribution widely adopted across the field.

The researcher's primary contribution rests on the 2009 article 'Co-creating brands: Diagnosing and designing the relationship experience,' published in the Journal of Business Research. This work appears to introduce a structured approach to understanding brand relationships through the lens of co-creation and experience design.

This line of work addresses the need for diagnostic and design-oriented frameworks in brand management. By focusing on the relationship experience, the research suggests a shift toward interactive, co-created brand dynamics rather than static brand positioning, offering a novel perspective on consumer-brand interactions.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,268. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature indicates that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating broad adoption and influence beyond the researcher's immediate academic circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4 · 2 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar

CORE PAPER

[Co-creating brands: Diagnosing and designing the relationship experience](#)

2009 · Journal of Business Research · 1,268 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 735 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research (2011)	University of Auckland	New Zealand	Background
2	Value co-creation: concept and measurement (2014)	—	—	Methodology
3	Customer loyalty: a review and future directions with a special focus on the hospitality industry (2015)	The Ohio State University	United States	Influential
4	Moving the customer experience field forward: introducing the touchpoints, context, qualities (TCQ) nomenclature (2020)	Boston College, Ghent University, International University of Monaco	Belgium, Monaco, United States	Background

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
Ghent University	Belgium	SCImago #330 · THE 115 · QS 162	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Auckland	New Zealand	SCImago #618 · THE =156 · QS 65	1
Boston College	United States	SCImago #3099 · THE 251–300 · QS =526	1
St. John's University	United States	—	1
The Ohio State University	United States	THE =108 · QS 190	1
International University of Monaco	Monaco	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	2
Belgium	1
Monaco	1
New Zealand	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	Co-creating brands: Diagnosing and designing the relationship experience	4	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)