Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Professor Per Carlbring

Department of Psychology at Stockholm 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	2	113
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.

44.4% independent of 9 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	4
Self-citation	0
Co-author	5
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 evidence base comparing guided internet-based and face-to-face cognitive behavior therapy efficacy through a seminal systematic review and meta-analysis.

The researcher's primary contribution rests on a 2014 systematic review and meta-analysis published in World Psychiatry, which compared guided internet-based cognitive behavior therapy against traditional face-to-face delivery for psychiatric and somatic disorders. This work serves as the core anchor for this line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher identified in the provided data.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in understanding the comparative effectiveness of digital mental health interventions versus standard care. By synthesizing existing evidence, the researcher provided a rigorous assessment of whether guided online therapies could serve as viable alternatives to in-person treatment, a question of growing importance in healthcare delivery.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 1,635, indicating widespread recognition within the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 66.7% originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has influenced the broader scientific community beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 3

CORE PAPER

Guided Internet-based vs. Face-To-Face Cognitive Behavior Therapy for Psychiatric and Somatic Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

2014 · World Psychiatry · 1,635 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,027 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2014 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Major depressive disorder (2023)	Amsterdam UMC, Centre for Addiction & Mental Health, Deakin University	Australia, Canada, Japan	—
2	Computer therapy for the anxiety and depression disorders is effective, acceptable and practical health care: An updated meta-analysis (2018)	Curtin University, St George's University of London, University of California, Los Angeles	Australia, Netherlands, United Kingdom	—
3	Cognitive and behavioral therapies in the treatment of insomnia: A meta-analysis (2017)	VU University	Netherlands	—

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 rigorous evidence base for virtual reality exposure therapy in treating anxiety disorders through a comprehensive meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the synthesis of clinical evidence regarding virtual reality exposure therapy for anxiety and related disorders, anchored by a seminal 2019 meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the need for consolidated, high-level evidence in a rapidly evolving therapeutic field. By aggregating data from multiple randomized controlled trials, the researcher provided a standardized assessment of efficacy that likely clarified the clinical utility of virtual reality interventions at a critical juncture in their adoption.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated 1,132 citations, indicating substantial uptake by the scientific community. Furthermore, citation analysis reveals that 66.7% of classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting the work has influenced broader academic discourse beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network.

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

CORE PAPER

Virtual reality exposure therapy for anxiety and related disorders: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

2019 · 1,132 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 697 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Digital Health Interventions for Delivery of Mental Health Care: Systematic and Comprehensive Meta-Review (2022)	Simon Fraser University, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver Coastal Health Research Institute	Canada	**Influential**

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
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Netherlands	SCImago #110 · THE =176 · QS =194	4
Karolinska Institutet	Sweden	—	4
Stockholm University	Sweden	SCImago #578 · THE 201–250 · QS =147	3
Linköping University	Sweden	SCImago #921 · THE 201–250 · QS =310	3
Curtin University	Australia	SCImago #1031 · THE 251–300 · QS 183	2
University of California, Los Angeles	United States	SCImago #70 · THE =18 · QS 46	2
Imperial College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #69 · THE 8 · QS 2	1
The University of British Columbia	Canada	SCImago #144 · THE 45 · QS 40	1
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	1
Boston University	United States	SCImago #272 · THE =76 · QS =88	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Columbia University	United States	SCImago #65 · THE 20 · QS =38	1
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	Belgium	—	1
Ulster University	United Kingdom	THE 601–800 · QS =609	1
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	1
Harvard University	United States	SCImago #4 · THE =5 · QS 5	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Netherlands	7
Australia	5
Sweden	4
United Kingdom	4
United States	3
Canada	2
Belgium	1
South Africa	1
Spain	1
Mexico	1
Japan	1
Germany	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	Guided Internet-based vs. Face-To-Face Cognitive Behavior Therapy for Psychiatric and Somatic Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis	3	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Virtual reality exposure therapy for anxiety and related disorders: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)