Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Peter M Bentler

University of California, Los Angeles

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

9	14	3	139
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

5 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 foundational statistical methods for significance testing and goodness-of-fit in covariance structure analysis, a seminal contribution widely adopted across psychological research.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the development of rigorous statistical frameworks for analyzing covariance structures, anchored by the 1980 paper 'Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures' published in Psychological Bulletin.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the need for robust inferential tools in structural modeling. By focusing on significance tests and goodness-of-fit, the researcher provided a methodological foundation that likely enabled more precise validation of theoretical models in psychology, distinguishing this approach from earlier, less formalized techniques.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated over 30,000 citations, indicating profound and lasting influence on the field. Analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that this methodological framework has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures

1980 · Psychological Bulletin · 30,082 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 19,429 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 1980 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	LVLM-EHub: A Comprehensive Evaluation Benchmark for Large Vision-Language Models	Shanghai AI Laboratory	China	—
2	CB-SEM vs PLS-SEM methods for research in social sciences and technology forecasting	Saudi Electronic University, University of Puerto Rico	Saudi Arabia, United States	—
3	Examining teachers' behavioural intention of using generative artificial intelligence tools for teaching and learning based on the extended technology acceptance model (2024)	The Education University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	—

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).

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher established widely adopted cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis, offering new alternatives to conventional standards in structural equation modeling.

The researcher's primary contribution rests on a seminal 1999 paper titled 'Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives,' published in Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal. This work appears to address the need for standardized benchmarks in evaluating model fit within structural equation modeling,

proposing new alternatives to traditional conventions. The titles suggest a methodological advancement aimed at clarifying how researchers assess the adequacy of covariance structures, a foundational task in multivariate statistical analysis.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake in the scientific community, with the core paper accumulating over 150,000 citations. This volume indicates that the proposed criteria have become a standard reference point for researchers across disciplines relying on structural equation modeling. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad impact beyond the author's immediate circle and confirming its status as a foundational tool in the field.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives

1999 · Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal · 153,707 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 104,798 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Mathematics papers from 1999 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Reporting reliability, convergent and discriminant validity with structural equation modeling: A review and best-practice recommendations (2024)	Auckland University of Technology, Elite Institute, Hang Seng University	China, Hong Kong, New Zealand	—

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).

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established foundational comparative fit indexes for structural models, a seminal contribution published in Psychological Bulletin that has garnered over 40,000 citations.

The researcher's primary contribution lies in the development of comparative fit indexes for structural models, as detailed in the 1990 paper published in Psychological Bulletin. This work stands as a singular, foundational piece in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in this specific line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address the need for robust metrics to evaluate structural models. The title suggests a focus on comparative analysis, indicating an effort to provide researchers with standardized tools for assessing model fit. The absence of follow-up papers by the researcher implies that this single publication successfully established a definitive framework that did not require further refinement by the original author.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its extensive uptake, with over 40,000 citations. Analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional bias.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2 **· 1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Comparative fit indexes in structural models

1990 · Psychological Bulletin · 40,036 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 25,199 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Mathematics papers from 1990 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Reporting reliability, convergent and discriminant validity with structural equation modeling: A review and best-practice recommendations (2024)	Auckland University of Technology, Elite Institute, Hang Seng University	China, Hong Kong, New Zealand	**Influential**
2	CB-SEM vs PLS-SEM methods for research in social sciences and technology forecasting (2021)	Saudi Electronic University, University of Puerto Rico	Saudi Arabia, United States	—

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
Elite Institute	—	—	1
Hang Seng University	China	—	1
University of Auckland	New Zealand	SCImago #618 · THE =156 · QS 65	1
The Hang Seng University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	SCImago #6805	1
Independent Researcher	United Kingdom	—	1
Auckland University of Technology	New Zealand	SCImago #3365 · THE 501–600 · QS =410	1
The Education University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	THE =195 · QS =530	1
The University of Auckland	New Zealand	SCImago #618 · THE =156 · QS 65	1
Saudi Electronic University	Saudi Arabia	SCImago #4960 · THE 1201–1500	1
University of Puerto Rico	United States	—	1
Shanghai AI Laboratory	China	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
China	2
Hong Kong	2
New Zealand	1
Saudi Arabia	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.

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.

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	Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Contribution	Core paper	Indep. cites	Supports
Contribution 3	Comparative fit indexes in structural models	2	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)