

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

## Jagmohan Raju

Unknown affiliation

[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

16	16	5	32
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 16 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	16
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 analyzing store brand performance, introducing key concepts that have become central to marketing literature.*

The researcher's seminal 1995 paper, 'The introduction and performance of store brands,' serves as the cornerstone of this contribution line. This work appears to have introduced a structured approach to understanding how private-label products enter the market and perform relative to national brands, establishing a baseline for subsequent academic inquiry in this domain.

This line of work addresses the need for rigorous empirical analysis of store brands, a topic that likely lacked comprehensive theoretical grounding at the time of publication. By focusing on both introduction strategies and performance metrics, the research suggests a novel integration of strategic marketing and performance evaluation, filling a gap in understanding the competitive dynamics between manufacturer and retailer brands.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 873, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the field. Furthermore, the fact that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers underscores the work's broad impact beyond the researcher's immediate circle, confirming its status as a widely adopted reference point for independent scholarly investigation.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

#### CORE PAPER

### [The introduction and performance of store brands](#)

1995 · 873 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 594 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 1995 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Agency Selling or Reselling? Channel Structures in Electronic Retailing</a> (2016)	Carnegie Mellon University, Columbia University, University of Pennsylvania	United States	—
2	<a href="#">Platform Information Transparency and Effects on Third-Party Suppliers and Offline Retailers</a> (2021)	Kobe University	Japan	Background
3	<a href="#">Why Store Brand Penetration Varies by Retailer</a> (1997)	University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania	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).

## Contribution 2

### Claim – Contribution 2

*The researcher established a foundational framework linking brand loyalty to competitive price promotional strategies, a seminal contribution that has significantly influenced marketing literature.*

The researcher's primary contribution rests on the 1990 paper 'The effects of brand loyalty on competitive price promotional strategies.' This work appears to address the critical intersection of consumer behavior and pricing tactics, offering a theoretical

lens for understanding how loyalty moderates competitive responses. By focusing on this specific dynamic, the study likely filled a gap in understanding the strategic implications of customer retention on price competition.

The originality of this line of work is suggested by its enduring relevance. As a standalone seminal piece without direct follow-up papers by the same author, it indicates that the core theoretical framework was sufficiently robust to stand on its own. The title implies a novel synthesis of loyalty metrics with promotional strategy, moving beyond simple price elasticity models to incorporate behavioral constraints.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 595. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers. This high degree of independent uptake suggests that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader academic community, rather than being confined to a single research group or institution.

#### INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

##### CORE PAPER

### [The effects of brand loyalty on competitive price promotional strategies](#)

1990 - 595 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 397 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Business papers from 1990 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Online Consumer Review: Word-of-Mouth as a New Element of Marketing Communication Mix (2008)</a>	Eller College of Management, University of Arizona, University of Florida	United States	—
2	<a href="#">A National Customer Satisfaction Barometer: The Swedish Experience (1992)</a>	University of Michigan	United States	—
3	<a href="#">Measuring Switching Costs and the Determinants of Customer Retention in Internet-Enabled Businesses: A Study of the Online Brokerage Industry (2002)</a>	Carnegie Mellon University, University of Pennsylvania	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 is Influential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

### Contribution 3

#### Claim — Contribution 3

*The researcher established a foundational framework for analyzing fairness and channel coordination in supply chains, as evidenced by a seminal 2007 paper that has garnered over 1,000 citations.*

The researcher's primary contribution lies in the development of theoretical models addressing fairness and channel coordination, anchored by a seminal 2007 publication. This work serves as the cornerstone of their research line, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author listed in the provided data, suggesting the core paper stands as a definitive, self-contained contribution to the field.

This line of work appears to address critical gaps in understanding how behavioral factors, specifically fairness concerns, interact with traditional economic incentives in supply chain coordination. By focusing on these dual dimensions, the research likely introduced a novel perspective that diverged from purely efficiency-driven models prevalent at the time, offering a more nuanced view of inter-firm relationships.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its substantial citation count of 1,076, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the academic community. Furthermore, the fact that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers demonstrates that the work has achieved broad, cross-institutional impact, validating its importance beyond the researcher’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

**Fairness and channel coordination**

2007 · 1,076 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 707 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Economics papers from 2007 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	<a href="#">Modeling the Psychology of Consumer and Firm Behavior with Behavioral Economics</a> (2006)	California Institute of Technology, University of California, Berkeley, University of Houston	United States	—
2	<a href="#">Coordinating Supply and Demand on an On-Demand Service Platform with Impatient Customers</a> (2019)	Binghamton University, Singapore Management University, University of California, Irvine	China, Singapore, United States	—
3	<a href="#">Supply Chain Transparency and Blockchain Design</a> (2024)	Cornell University, Renmin University of China	China, United States	—
4	<a href="#">Decisions and coordination of green e-commerce supply chain considering green manufacturer's fairness concerns</a> (2020)	Shandong University of Finance and Economics, The University of Tennessee	China, People’s Republic of China, 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
University of Pennsylvania	United States	SCImago #52 · THE 14 · QS 15	3
Carnegie Mellon University	United States	SCImago #266 · THE 24 · QS 52	2
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	2
Tulane University	United States	SCImago #1570 · THE 401–500 · QS =597	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
University of California, Irvine	United States	SCImago #329 · THE 97 · QS 293	1
Renmin University of China	China	SCImago #2319	1
University of Pittsburgh	United States	SCImago #212 · QS =281	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Columbia University	United States	SCImago #65 · THE 20 · QS =38	1
Zhejiang University	China	SCImago #6 · THE 39 · QS 49	1
University of Michigan	United States	SCImago #43 · THE 23 · QS 45	1
The University of Tennessee	United States	—	1
University of Southern California	United States	SCImago #192 · THE =73 · QS 146	1
Shandong University of Finance and Economics	People's Republic of China	—	1

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	13
China	6
Japan	1
People's Republic of China	1
Singapore	1
United Kingdom	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.

2008  2

2016  2

## 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	The introduction and performance of store brands	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	The effects of brand loyalty on competitive price promotional strategies	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	Fairness and channel coordination	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)