

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Stefan G. Hofmann

Alexander von Humboldt Professor, Philipps-Universität Marburg

[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

6 Citing papers mapped	6 Citation edges	1 Home papers mapped	143 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 6 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	6
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 conducted a seminal meta-analytic review quantifying the efficacy of mindfulness-based therapy for anxiety and depression, establishing a foundational evidence base in clinical psychology.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is a comprehensive meta-analytic review published in the Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, which systematically evaluates the impact of mindfulness-based therapy on anxiety and depression. This work serves as the cornerstone of their cited research portfolio.

ORIGINALITY: By employing a meta-analytic approach, the researcher addressed the need for a rigorous, aggregated assessment of mindfulness interventions. This methodological choice allowed for a synthesis of existing evidence to clarify the therapeutic value of mindfulness, distinguishing this work from single-study reports and providing a broader, more reliable perspective on clinical outcomes.

SIGNIFICANCE: The paper has garnered substantial attention, with over 6,800 citations, indicating its status as a highly influential resource in the field. Analysis of citing literature reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and utilized by the broader scientific community beyond the author’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

CORE PAPER

[The effect of mindfulness-based therapy on anxiety and depression: A meta-analytic review.](#)

2010 · Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology · 6,817 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 3,825 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 2010 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Mindfulness-based interventions: an overall review (2021)	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	China	—
2	The neuroscience of mindfulness meditation. (2015)	Technical University of Munich, Texas Tech University, University of Oregon	Germany, United States	—
3	A pilot study and randomized controlled trial of the mindful self-compassion program (2013)	Harvard Medical School, University of Texas at Austin	United States	—
4	The Body Keeps the Score: Brain, Mind, and Body in the Healing of Trauma: by Bessel van der Kolk, MD (2015)	Southern California Permanente Medical Group	United States	—
5	Association between physical exercise and mental health in 1.2 million individuals in the USA between 2011 and 2015: a cross-sectional study (2018)	Laureate Institute for Brain Research, Yale University	United States	—
6	Meditation programs for psychological stress and well-being: a systematic review and meta-analysis (2014)	Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, The Johns Hopkins University	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
Technical University of Munich	Germany	SCImago #187 · THE 27 · QS =22	1
The Johns Hopkins University	United States	SCImago #33 · THE 16 · QS 24	1
Yale University	United States	SCImago #76 · THE 10 · QS 21	1
Texas Tech University	United States	SCImago #2022 · THE 601–800 · QS 731-740	1
The Chinese University of Hong Kong	China	SCImago #163 · THE =41 · QS =32	1
Harvard Medical School	United States	SCImago #12	1
University of Texas at Austin	United States	THE 50 · QS 68	1
University of Oregon	United States	SCImago #2111 · THE 401–500 · QS 751-760	1
Laureate Institute for Brain Research	United States	SCImago #5171	1
Southern California Permanente Medical Group	United States	SCImago #4614	1
Johns Hopkins School of Public Health	United States	—	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	5
China	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.

2015  2

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	The effect of mindfulness-based therapy on anxiety and depression: A meta-analytic review.	6	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)