

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Lee Ritterband

Professor, University of Virginia

[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 Citing papers mapped	9 Citation edges	2 Home papers mapped	58 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 9 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	9
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 internet-based psychological interventions, synthesizing current practices and future directions in a highly cited 2003 review.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2003 paper 'Internet interventions: In review, in use, and into the future,' published in *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice*. This work serves as the core anchor for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author identified in the provided data.

This line of work appears to address the emerging need to systematically evaluate and contextualize the use of internet-based tools in psychological practice. By reviewing current applications and projecting future trajectories, the researcher provided a critical synthesis at a time when digital mental health interventions were gaining prominence but lacked comprehensive scholarly consolidation.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 574. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and utilized by the broader scientific community outside the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

[Internet interventions: In review, in use, and into the future.](#)

2003 · *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice* · 574 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 387 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Psychology papers from 2003 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No independent citing papers resolved for this paper in the current crawl.

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established the efficacy of internet-delivered cognitive-behavioral therapy for insomnia through a seminal systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

The researcher's primary contribution is the comprehensive evaluation of internet-delivered cognitive-behavioral therapy for insomnia, anchored by a 2016 systematic review and meta-analysis published in *Sleep Medicine Reviews*. This work synthesizes evidence from randomized controlled trials to assess treatment efficacy.

This line of work appears to address the need for rigorous, aggregated evidence regarding digital mental health interventions. By focusing on a systematic review and meta-analysis, the researcher provided a consolidated assessment of existing randomized controlled trials, offering a clear benchmark for the effectiveness of this specific therapeutic approach.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its high citation count of 858, indicating substantial uptake by the scientific community. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting the work has influenced the broader field beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 9

CORE PAPER

Efficacy of internet-delivered cognitive-behavioral therapy for insomnia – A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

2016 · Sleep Medicine Reviews · 858 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 644 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2016 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The European Insomnia Guideline: An update on the diagnosis and treatment of insomnia 2023 (2023)	East-Viru Central Hospital, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Hospital Cuf	Austria, Canada, Czech Republic	—
2	Management of Insomnia (2024)	Université Laval, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center	Canada	—
3	European guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of insomnia (2017)	Antwerp University Hospital and University of Antwerp, Burnasyan Federal Medical Biophysical Center of the Federal Medical Biological Agency, Hospital Cuf	Belgium, Denmark, Finland	—
4	Clinical practice guideline for the pharmacologic treatment of chronic insomnia in adults: an American Academy of Sleep Medicine clinical practice guideline (2017)	American Academy of Sleep Medicine, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Johns Hopkins University	United States	—
5	Insomnia disorder: State of the science and challenges for the future (2022)	Big Health Ltd, Medical Center - University of Freiburg, Faculty of Medicine, Netherlands Institute for Neuroscience, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences	Australia, Germany, Netherlands	Background
6	An overview of and recommendations for more accessible digital mental health services (2022)	Northwestern University, Rush University Medical Center	United States	—
7	Short sleep duration and health outcomes: a systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression (2017)	Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine/School of Public Health, Nihon University School of Medicine, Oita University	Japan	Background
8	Understanding and Promoting Effective Engagement With Digital Behavior Change Interventions (2016)	Coventry University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Northwestern University	Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States	—
9	Efficacy of digital cognitive behavioural therapy for insomnia: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (2020)	National University of Singapore, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore	Singapore	—

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
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	3
Stavanger University Hospital	Norway	SCImago #2412	2
Hospital Cuf	Portugal	—	2
University of Bergen	Norway	SCImago #1182 · THE 251–300 · QS =287	2
Université Laval	Canada	THE 401–500 · QS =469	2
Northwestern University	United States	THE 30 · QS =42	2
Northumbria University	United Kingdom	SCImago #1471 · THE 401–500	2
University Medical Center Ljubljana	Slovenia	—	2
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	1
University of California, San Francisco	United States	SCImago #98	1
University of California, San Diego	United States	SCImago #120 · THE 47 · QS 66	1
Institute of Psychiatry and Neurology	Poland	SCImago #6515	1
University of Pisa	Italy	THE 351–400 · QS =343	1
University of Amsterdam	Netherlands	SCImago #75 · THE =62 · QS 53	1
University of Pittsburgh	United States	SCImago #212 · QS =281	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	4
United Kingdom	4
Germany	3
Netherlands	3
Portugal	2
Iceland	2
Italy	2
Finland	2
Slovenia	2
Spain	2
France	2
Switzerland	2

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.

2017  3

2022  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	Internet interventions: In review, in use, and into the future.	0	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Efficacy of internet-delivered cognitive-behavioral therapy for insomnia – A systematic	9	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Contribution	Core paper	Indep. cites	Supports
	review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials		