

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)


James Coyne or James C. Coyne

Professor of Psychology in Psychiatry, UPenn, Professor of Health Psychology, U Groningen

[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



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.

77.8% independent of 9 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
Self-citation	0
Co-author	2
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 understanding how interpersonal responses influence depression, as evidenced by a seminal 1976 paper that has garnered over 2,600 citations.

The researcher's primary contribution lies in defining the critical role of social interaction in the context of depression. This work is anchored by the 1976 article 'Depression and the response of others,' published in the Journal of Abnormal Psychology, which serves as the cornerstone of this specific line of inquiry.

This research appears to have addressed a significant gap in understanding the social dimensions of mental health. By focusing on the 'response of others,' the work suggests a shift toward examining how external interpersonal dynamics contribute to or mitigate depressive states, rather than viewing depression solely through an intrapsychic lens. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single publication stands as a definitive, self-contained theoretical contribution.

The significance of this work is demonstrated by its substantial citation count of 2,670, indicating widespread adoption and influence within the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers. This high degree of independence confirms that the contribution has been validated and utilized by the broader scientific community, rather than being sustained by self-citation or institutional echo chambers.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 2

CORE PAPER

[Depression and the response of others.](#)

1976 · Journal of Abnormal Psychology · 2,670 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,472 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 1976 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Social support and health: a review of physiological processes potentially underlying links to disease outcomes (2006)	University of Utah	United States	—
2	The Psychology of Happiness (2001)	Oxford University	United Kingdom	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* – ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) – the "built on / relied upon" pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established a foundational comparative framework for stress measurement, contrasting daily hassles and uplifts with major life events, as evidenced by a seminal 1981 paper with over 6,000 citations.

The researcher's contribution centers on a seminal 1981 publication in the Journal of Behavioral Medicine that compares two distinct modes of stress measurement: daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. This work stands as a core reference point in the field, with no follow-up papers by the same researcher listed in this specific line of inquiry, suggesting the original study itself constitutes the primary intellectual asset.

This line of work appears to address a critical methodological gap by evaluating the relative utility of measuring chronic, everyday stressors against acute, major life events. By juxtaposing these two approaches, the researcher provided a comparative

basis that likely influenced how subsequent studies design their stress assessment protocols, moving beyond a singular focus on major life events.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its extensive uptake, with the core paper accumulating over 6,000 citations. Notably, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional echo chambers.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

CORE PAPER

[Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events](#)

1981 · Journal of Behavioral Medicine · 6,030 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 2,003 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 1981 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. (1989)	Kent State University	United States	—
2	Stress, coping, and social support processes: Where are we? What next? (1995)	Vanderbilt University	United States	—
3	A Global Measure of Perceived Stress (1983)	Carnegie-Mellon University, University of Oregon	United States	—
4	Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? (1998)	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	—
5	Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales (1988)	Southern Methodist University, University of Minnesota	United States	—

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column flags citations Semantic Scholar identifies as *influential* — ones that substantively build on the work (S2's isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015) — the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits. Counsel should quote the citing text for the strongest of these.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Brock University	Canada	SCImago #6013 · THE 1201–1500 · QS 1201-1400	2
University of California, Berkeley	United States	SCImago #95 · THE 9 · QS =17	2
Hull York Medical School	United Kingdom	SCImago #4327	1
Yildirim Beyazit University	Turkey	—	1
Communication University of China	China	SCImago #4228 · THE 1501+	1
University of Calgary	Canada	SCImago #399 · THE 200 · QS 211	1
National Taiwan University	Taiwan	SCImago #513 · THE 140 · QS =63	1
Yale University	United States	SCImago #76 · THE 10 · QS 21	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Anhui Medical University	China	SCImago #1942	1
Oxford University	United Kingdom	—	1
Weill Cornell Medicine	United States	SCImago #220	1
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	1
University of Leeds	United Kingdom	SCImago #377 · THE 118 · QS 86	1
Sungkyunkwan University	South Korea	SCImago #527 · THE 87 · QS =126	1
Bursa Uludag University	Turkey	THE 1501+	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	20
United Kingdom	4
China	4
Canada	4
Turkey	3
Iran	2
Italy	2
Switzerland	1
Taiwan	1
Slovenia	1
Brasil	1
Israel	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.

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	Depression and the response of others.	2	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events	5	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)