Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Jessica Marie Otis

Assistant Professor of History, George Mason 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

9	9	1	8
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 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 advanced interoperable network ontologies for the Digital Humanities, establishing a foundational framework that has garnered sustained, independent scholarly attention.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2016 paper 'Towards Interoperable Network Ontologies for the Digital Humanities.' This work appears to address the challenge of creating standardized, interoperable frameworks for network analysis within digital humanities research. By proposing ontological structures, the researcher sought to enable more consistent and comparable network studies across diverse digital humanities projects. The absence of follow-up papers by the same author suggests this core publication stands as a distinct, self-contained theoretical or methodological proposal rather than part of an extended series of incremental updates. The significance of this work is evidenced by its citation record, which includes 35 citations. Notably, all classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the contribution has resonated beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative circle. This high degree of independent uptake suggests the proposed ontologies have been adopted or referenced by the broader academic community as a useful reference point for interoperability in the field.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 9

CORE PAPER

Towards Interoperable Network Ontologies for the Digital Humanities

2016 · 35 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	BiographySampo–publishing and enriching biographies on the semantic web for digital humanities research (2019)	Finnish Literature Society	Finland	—
2	Analyzing biography collections historiographically as Linked Data: Case National Biography of Finland (2022)	Aalto University	Finland	—
3	Visualizing and Analyzing Networks of Named Entities in Biographical Dictionaries for Digital Humanities Research (2023)	University of Helsinki	Finland	Methodology
4	Analyzing the Lives of Finnish Academic People 1640–1899 in Nordic and Baltic Countries: AcademySampo Data Service and Portal (2022)	Aalto University	Finland	—
5	Reconciling and Using Historical Person Registers as Linked Open Data in the AcademySampo Portal and Data Service (2021)	University of Helsinki	Finland	—
6	Sociotechnical Factors Affecting Interoperability of Digital Humanities (2024)	RMIT University, University of Melbourne	Australia	—
7	<scp>Person-Oriented</scp> Ontologies Analysis for Digital Humanities Collections from a Metadata Crosswalk Perspective (2023)	RMIT University	Australia	Background
8	Distributed Character: Quantitative Models of the English Stage, 1550–1900 (2017)	—	—	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
9	Communication now and then: analyzing the Republic of Letters as a communication network (2022)	Aalto University, Tampere University, University of Helsinki	Finland	—

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 Visualizing and Analyzing Networks of Named Entities in Biographical Dictionaries for Digital Humanities Research

"Several related works [38,31,19,3,5] and network analysis and visualization methods [27] have influenced the tools presented in this paper."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Aalto University	Finland	SCImago #854 · THE =195 · QS =114	3
University of Helsinki	Finland	SCImago #368 · THE =105 · QS =116	3
RMIT University	Australia	THE 251–300 · QS 125	2
Finnish Literature Society	Finland	—	1
Tampere University	Finland	SCImago #1196 · THE 301–350 · QS =423	1
University of Melbourne	Australia	SCImago #72 · THE 37 · QS 19	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Finland	6
Australia	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.

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	Towards Interoperable Network Ontologies for the Digital Humanities	9	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)