

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Michael Kleinaltenkamp

Professor (Emeritus) of Business and Services Marketing, Freie Universitaet Berlin

[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

4	4	1	56
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

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 business customers evaluate solution quality and value in use, significantly advancing B2B marketing theory.

The researcher's primary contribution rests on the 2016 article 'How business customers judge solutions: Solution quality and value in use,' published in the Journal of Marketing. This work appears to define the core mechanisms through which organizational buyers assess the utility and quality of complex solutions.

This line of work addresses a critical gap in understanding B2B evaluation processes. By focusing on 'value in use,' the research suggests a shift from traditional transactional metrics to a more holistic assessment of how solutions perform within the customer's operational context. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author indicates this single publication serves as the definitive statement of this specific theoretical contribution.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 614, indicating widespread adoption in the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers. This high degree of independent uptake underscores the work's broad relevance and its status as a seminal reference point for scholars outside the researcher's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

[How business customers judge solutions: Solution quality and value in use](#)

2016 · Journal of Marketing · 614 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 329 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 2016 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The customer value proposition: evolution, development, and application in marketing (2017)	University of New South Wales, University of Paderborn, University of Sydney	Australia, Germany	—
2	Digital content marketing in business markets: Activities, consequences, and contingencies along the customer journey (2022)	University of Jyväskylä, University of Turku	Finland	—
3	Value Creation and Value Capture Alignment in Business Model Innovation: A Process View on Outcome-Based Business Models (2020)	Copenhagen Business School, ESADE Business School, Luleå University of Technology	Denmark, Sweden	—
4	Servitization: A contemporary thematic review of four major research streams (2019)	Eawag; Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Linköping University, Polytechnic University of Bari	Italy, Sweden, Switzerland	Background

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 New South Wales	Australia	SCImago #107 · QS 20	1
University of Turku	Finland	SCImago #1389 · THE 301–350 · QS 366	1
University of Jyväskylä	Finland	SCImago #2621 · THE 401–500 · QS 498	1
Polytechnic University of Bari	Italy	THE 501–600	1
Luleå University of Technology	Sweden	SCImago #2696	1
University of Paderborn	Germany	—	1
University of Sydney	Australia	SCImago #93 · THE =53 · QS =25	1
Linköping University	Sweden	SCImago #921 · THE 201–250 · QS =310	1
ESADE Business School	Spain	—	1
Eawag: Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology	Switzerland	—	1
The University of Manchester	United Kingdom	SCImago #196 · THE 56 · QS 35	1
Copenhagen Business School	Denmark	SCImago #5086	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Sweden	2
Denmark	1
Finland	1
Germany	1
Italy	1
Switzerland	1
Australia	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.

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	How business customers judge solutions: Solution quality and value in use	4	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)