Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Jake Hofman

Senior Principal Researcher, 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

7	7	1	36
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 7 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
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 pioneered the application of web search data to predict consumer behavior, establishing a foundational methodology in digital analytics as evidenced by a seminal PNAS publication.

The researcher's contribution centers on the seminal 2010 paper 'Predicting consumer behavior with Web search,' published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. This work appears to establish a novel framework for leveraging digital footprints to forecast market trends, serving as the primary anchor for this line of inquiry.

This line of work addresses the gap in traditional consumer analytics by introducing web search activity as a predictive variable. The title suggests a methodological shift toward real-time, large-scale digital data, offering a new lens for understanding consumer intent that was not previously standard in the field.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its high citation count of 956, indicating substantial uptake by the academic community. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate network and institution.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

Predicting consumer behavior with Web search

2010 · Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS) · 956 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 650 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2010 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	From Predictive to Prescriptive Analytics (2020)	Cornell University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	Methodology
2	The Parable of Google Flu: Traps in Big Data Analysis (2014)	Harvard University, Institute for Scientific Interchange Foundation, Northeastern University	Italy, United States	—
3	Big Data: New Tricks for Econometrics (2013)	—	—	—
4	Measuring objective and subjective well-being: dimensions and data sources (2020)	—	—	—
5	Predicting the Present with Google Trends (2012)	Google Inc., University of California, Berkeley	United States	—
6	Supply chain digitisation trends: An integration of knowledge management (2020)	University of Rhode Island	United States	—
7	Ten years of research change using Google Trends: From the perspective of big data utilizations and applications (2017)	Korea Institute of Science & Technology Information	South Korea	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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY From Predictive to Prescriptive Analytics

> *"By and large, ML does not address optimal decisionmaking under uncertainty that is appropriate forOR/ MS problems."*

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Institute for Scientific Interchange Foundation	Italy	—	1
Korea Institute of Science & Technology Information	South Korea	SCImago #4158	1
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	1
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #41 · THE 2 · QS 1	1
University of Houston	United States	SCImago #893 · THE 401–500 · QS =556	1
University of California, Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	1
Northeastern University	United States	QS 384	1
Harvard University	United States	SCImago #4 · THE =5 · QS 5	1
Google Inc.	United States	—	1
University of Rhode Island	United States	SCImago #2783 · THE 801–1000 · QS 1001-1200	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	4
Italy	1
South Korea	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 3

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).

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	Predicting consumer behavior with Web search	7	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)