Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Mengtian Zhao

Unknown affiliation

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

8	8	4	3
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 8 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	8
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 natural experiment framework to analyze how media disaster reporting shapes public risk perception and behavioral responses to escalating tornado warnings.

CLAIM: The researcher's contribution centers on a 2019 study titled 'Media disaster reporting effects on public risk perception and response to escalating tornado warnings: A natural experiment,' which serves as the foundational work in this specific line of inquiry. This paper appears to offer a structured approach to understanding the intersection of media communication and public safety behavior during severe weather events.

ORIGINALITY: By framing the study as a natural experiment, the work suggests a methodological innovation in isolating the causal effects of media reporting on public response. The titles indicate a focus on the dynamic nature of escalating warnings, addressing a gap in understanding how real-time information dissemination influences individual risk assessment and decision-making processes during tornado events.

SIGNIFICANCE: The core paper has accumulated 63 citations, indicating a solid level of engagement within the academic community. Notably, all 8 classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has resonated beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network. This independence underscores the broader relevance and utility of the findings for scholars studying disaster communication and public risk perception.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5

CORE PAPER

Media disaster reporting effects on public risk perception and response to escalating tornado warnings: A natural experiment

2019 · Risk analysis 39 (3), 535-552, 2019 · 63 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Risk Perception: Reflections on 40 Years of Research. (2020)	Institute for Environmental Decisions, University of Southern California	Switzerland, United States	—
2	Stress of university students before and after campus closure in response to COVID-19. (2022)	University of California, Irvine	United States	—
3	Insights into Flood Risk Misperceptions of Homeowners in the Dutch River Delta. (2020)	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Netherlands	—
4	Trajectories of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and posttraumatic growth among victims 6 months after the 2021 Henan floods: predictive roles of social support and short video exposure during the disaster. (2025)	Nanjing University, Xi'an Jiaotong University	China	—
5	News media coverage of hurricane events and Caribbean tourism: a critical analysis of the last 40 years (2024)	University of Waterloo	Canada	—

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 developed a framework for predicting information security policy compliance intentions and behaviors across six distinct employee-based risk categories.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2017 paper titled 'Predicting information security policy compliance intentions and behavior for six employee-based risks.' This work appears to establish a structured approach to understanding how employees respond to security policies in the context of specific risk scenarios.

This line of work addresses the challenge of modeling human behavior in information security. By focusing on six specific employee-based risks, the research suggests a move toward granular, risk-specific compliance modeling rather than generalized policy adherence. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates this core publication stands as the primary articulation of this specific framework.

The work has garnered 16 citations, all from independent researchers. This 100% independent citation rate suggests that the framework has been adopted and utilized by external scholars to inform their own studies on security compliance, indicating a measurable impact on the broader academic community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 1

CORE PAPER

Predicting information security policy compliance intentions and behavior for six employee-based risks

2017 · Journal of information privacy and security 13 (4), 260-281, 2017 · 16 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Psychological Capital and Information Security Policy Compliance (2024)	Hangzhou Dianzi University, Zhejiang University of Water Resources and Electric Power	P. R. China	—

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
University of Southern California	United States	SCImago #192 · THE =73 · QS 146	2
University of Waterloo	Canada	SCImago #491 · THE =162 · QS =119	1
Xi'an Jiaotong University	China	SCImago #58 · THE 201–250 · QS 305	1
University of California, Irvine	United States	SCImago #329 · THE 97 · QS 293	1
Hangzhou Dianzi University	P. R. China	SCImago #1244 · THE 1201–1500	1
Nanjing University	China	SCImago #178 · THE =62 · QS =103	1
Institute for Environmental Decisions	Switzerland	—	1

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Zhejiang University of Water Resources and Electric Power	P. R. China	SCImago #9770	1
The Bulls Run Group	United States	—	1
RTX Technology Research Center	United States	—	1
Virginia Tech	United States	—	1
Technical University of Darmstadt	Germany	SCImago #1457 · THE 251–300 · QS =253	1
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Netherlands	SCImago #110 · THE =176 · QS =194	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	3
China	1
Germany	1
Canada	1
P. R. China	1
Switzerland	1
Netherlands	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	Media disaster reporting effects on public risk perception and response to escalating tornado warnings: A natural experiment	5	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	Predicting information security policy compliance intentions and behavior for six employee-based risks	1	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)