Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Juergen Bauhus

University Freiburg

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

7	7	1	101
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.

85.7% independent of 7 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	6
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
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 published a seminal 2019 Nature paper linking arthropod decline to landscape-level drivers, establishing a critical framework for understanding large-scale ecological changes.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the identification of landscape-level drivers as key factors in arthropod decline within grasslands and forests, as demonstrated in their 2019 publication in Nature. This work serves as the foundational piece for this line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: By focusing on landscape-level drivers rather than localized factors, this research appears to address a significant gap in understanding the broader spatial dynamics of biodiversity loss. The title suggests a shift toward macro-ecological explanations for observed declines in arthropod populations.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has garnered substantial attention, with over 1,600 citations, indicating its high impact on the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, underscoring the work's broad acceptance and influence beyond the researcher's immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

CORE PAPER

Arthropod decline in grasslands and forests is associated with landscape-level drivers

2019 · Nature · 1,632 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,011 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Environmental Science papers from 2019 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Food system impacts on biodiversity loss (2021)	Chatham House, University of Guelph	Canada, United Kingdom	—
2	Agriculture and climate change are reshaping insect biodiversity worldwide (2022)	UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, University College London	United Kingdom	—
3	Beyond organic farming – harnessing biodiversity-friendly landscapes (2021)	Centre for Ecological Research, University of Göttingen, University of Hohenheim	China, Germany, Hungary	—
4	Chemical pollution: A growing peril and potential catastrophic risk to humanity (2021)	Australian National University, Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment (CRC CARE), Cranfield University	Australia, United Kingdom	—
5	Insect decline in the Anthropocene: Death by a thousand cuts (2021)	National Academy of Sciences, University of Connecticut, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	—
6	Scientists' warning to humanity on insect extinctions (2020)	Brandenburg University of Technology, Deakin University, Finnish Museum of Natural History	Australia, Finland, Germany	—

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
Deakin University	Australia	SCImago #607 · THE 201–250 · QS =207	1
Technical University of Munich	Germany	SCImago #187 · THE 27 · QS =22	1
University of Göttingen	Germany	THE =122 · QS 243	1
Finnish Museum of Natural History	Finland	—	1
Brandenburg University of Technology	Germany	—	1
New University of Lisbon, Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia	Portugal	—	1
University of South Australia	Australia	SCImago #2033	1
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	United States	SCImago #206 · THE =41	1
The University of Newcastle	Australia	SCImago #1436 · THE 251–300	1
University College London	United Kingdom	SCImago #30	1
Australian National University	Australia	SCImago #604 · THE =73 · QS =32	1
University of Würzburg	Germany	THE 179	1
Cranfield University	United Kingdom	SCImago #1842	1
University of Guelph	Canada	SCImago #1566 · THE 401–500 · QS =504	1
Lancaster University	United Kingdom	SCImago #1408 · THE =184 · QS 157	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Germany	3
United Kingdom	3
Australia	2
Finland	1
Hungary	1
Portugal	1
Switzerland	1
United States	1
Canada	1
China	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	Arthropod decline in grasslands and forests is associated with landscape-level drivers	6	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)