Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Daniel Fulford

Boston University

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

10	10	2	34
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.

70.0% independent of 10 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
Self-citation	0
Co-author	3
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 developed an interdisciplinary digital phenotyping platform for mental health, establishing a collaborative framework for smartphone-based care that has garnered significant independent academic attention.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2019 publication in the Journal of Technology in Behavioral Science, which details the creation of a digital health smartphone app and digital phenotyping platform. This work emphasizes an interdisciplinary and collaborative approach to addressing diverse healthcare needs, particularly within mental health contexts.

This line of work appears to address the need for integrated, technology-driven solutions in behavioral science. By combining digital phenotyping with a collaborative development model, the research suggests a novel method for leveraging smartphone technology to support mental health interventions, moving beyond traditional siloed approaches.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its citation record, with 227 citations indicating substantial uptake in the field. Notably, 70% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has influenced scholars outside the researcher's immediate network and institution, thereby demonstrating broad relevance and impact.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

CORE PAPER

Creating a Digital Health Smartphone App and Digital Phenotyping Platform for Mental Health and Diverse Healthcare Needs: an Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Approach

2019 · Journal of Technology in Behavioral Science · 227 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 173 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Medicine papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Digital Mental Health and COVID-19: Using Technology Today to Accelerate the Curve on Access and Quality Tomorrow (2020)	Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health, University of Manchester	United Kingdom, United States	Background
2	Designing and scaling up integrated youth mental health care (2022)	University of Melbourne	Australia	—
3	Mobile Apps for Mental Health Issues: Meta-Review of Meta-Analyses (2020)	Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois, l'Institut Universitaire en Santé Mentale de Montréal, University du Quebec a Montreal	Canada, Switzerland	Background
4	Human-Computer Interaction in Digital Mental Health (2022)	Griffith University	Australia	Background
5	Digital Interventions for the Treatment of Depression: A Meta-Analytic Review (2021)	Albert-Ludwigs-University, Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg, Ulm University	Finland, Germany, Italy	—
6	Development and Evaluation of a Mental Health Chatbot Using ChatGPT 4.0: Mixed Methods User Experience Study With Korean Users (2025)	Sungkyunkwan University	South Korea	—

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 advanced the understanding of childhood trauma's role in clinical high risk for psychosis through a seminal 2019 study widely cited by independent scholars.

CLAIM: The researcher established a foundational link between childhood trauma and clinical high risk for psychosis, primarily through a 2019 paper published in Schizophrenia Research. This work serves as the core contribution of this line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: The titles indicate a focus on integrating developmental trauma history with early psychosis risk assessment. By addressing this intersection, the researcher appears to have filled a gap in understanding how early adverse experiences influence clinical trajectories in high-risk populations.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated 173 citations, indicating substantial uptake by the scientific community. Notably, 70% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting the work has influenced broader scholarly discourse beyond the author's immediate network.

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

CORE PAPER

Childhood trauma and clinical high risk for psychosis

2019 · Schizophrenia Research · 173 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 116 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Psychology papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The role of childhood trauma in psychosis and schizophrenia: a systematic review (2022)	California Institute of Behavioral Neurosciences & Psychology	United States	**Methodology**

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 The role of childhood trauma in psychosis and schizophrenia: a systematic review

"The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ) is a valuable survey tool used to screen for experiences of abuse and neglect [9]."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center	United States	SCImago #647	2
Freie Universität Berlin	Germany	SCImago #733 · THE =113	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg	Germany	—	1
Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School	United States	—	1
Sungkyunkwan University	South Korea	SCImago #527 · THE 87 · QS =126	1
University of Helsinki	Finland	SCImago #368 · THE =105 · QS =116	1
Georgia Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #270 · THE =41 · QS =123	1
Harvard Medical School	United States	SCImago #12	1
Griffith University	Australia	SCImago #869 · THE 251–300 · QS 268	1
University of Manchester	United Kingdom	SCImago #196 · THE 56 · QS 35	1
University of California San Diego	United States	SCImago #120 · THE 47 · QS 66	1
Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth	United States	—	1
University of Melbourne	Australia	SCImago #72 · THE 37 · QS 19	1
Albert-Ludwigs-University	Germany	—	1
University of Montreal	Canada	SCImago #692 · THE 150 · QS 168	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	4
Australia	2
Germany	2
Canada	1
India	1
Italy	1
Netherlands	1
South Korea	1
Switzerland	1
United Kingdom	1
Finland	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	Creating a Digital Health Smartphone App and Digital Phenotyping Platform for Mental Health and Diverse Healthcare Needs: an Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Approach	6	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Childhood trauma and clinical high risk for psychosis	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)