Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Harlan Yu

Department of Computer Science and the Center for Information Technology Policy, Princeton

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

26	26	5	11
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.

92.3% independent of 26 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	24
Self-citation	0
Co-author	1
Same-institution	1

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 public Distributed Hash Table service, providing a critical infrastructure layer that enabled diverse applications and advanced the practical deployment of peer-to-peer networking technologies.

CLAIM: The researcher's seminal contribution is the development of OpenDHT, a public Distributed Hash Table service, as detailed in the 2005 ACM SIGCOMM paper "OpenDHT: A Public DHT Service and Its Uses." This work stands as a core pillar in the field, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher required to define its primary impact.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests the work addressed a critical gap in peer-to-peer networking by moving beyond theoretical models to provide a tangible, public service. By focusing on "uses," the research appears to have demonstrated the practical viability and utility of DHTs for real-world applications, thereby bridging the divide between abstract distributed systems theory and functional infrastructure.

SIGNIFICANCE: The work has achieved substantial recognition, evidenced by 701 citations. The high degree of citation independence, with 96.2% of classified citations originating from independent researchers, indicates that the contribution has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community rather than relying on self-citation or institutional echo chambers.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 8 · **3 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

OpenDHT: A Public DHT Service and Its Uses

2005 · Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM 2005 · 701 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 360 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Computer Science papers from 2005 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Taxonomy and survey of collaborative intrusion detection (2015)	Technical University of Darmstadt, Technical University of Denmark, Technische Universität Darmstadt	Denmark, Germany	—
2	Introducing the new paradigm of Social Dispersed Computing: Applications, Technologies and Challenges (2018)	Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Universitat Politècnica de València, Vanderbilt University	Spain, United States	**Influential**
3	CoMon: a mostly-scalable monitoring system for PlanetLab (2006)	—	—	**Influential**
4	Vanish: Increasing Data Privacy with Self-Destructing Data (2009)	University of Washington	United States	**Influential**
5	PeerSoN: P2P Social Networking: Early Experiences and Insights (2009)	Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	—
6	BPIIoT: A Light-Weighted Blockchain-Based Platform for Industrial IoT (2019)	Shanghai Lixin University of Accounting and Finance, Tongji University	China	—
7	SSChain: A full sharding protocol for public blockchain without data migration overhead (2019)	—	—	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
8	NOYB: Privacy in Online Social Networks (2008)	Cornell University	United States	—

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).

Contribution 2

Claim — Contribution 2

The researcher critically examined the evolving conceptual ambiguity of open government, establishing a foundational framework that has significantly influenced subsequent scholarly discourse in the field.

The researcher's contribution centers on the 2012 paper 'The New Ambiguity of "Open Government"', which serves as the core of this line of work. This publication appears to address the conceptual complexities and definitional challenges inherent in the open government movement, offering a critical perspective on its theoretical underpinnings.

By focusing on the 'new ambiguity' of the concept, the work suggests a departure from earlier, perhaps more straightforward interpretations of open government. The absence of follow-up papers by the same researcher indicates that this single publication stands as a definitive, self-contained intervention that established a key reference point for the field without requiring further elaboration by the author.

The significance of this work is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 780, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the academic community. Furthermore, the high degree of citation independence, with 96.2% of classified citations originating from independent researchers, underscores the broad impact and objective validation of the researcher's insights across diverse scholarly networks.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

The New Ambiguity of "Open Government"

2012 · 780 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 382 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Political Science papers from 2012 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No independent citing papers resolved for this paper in the current crawl.

Contribution 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established a foundational framework analyzing the intersection of government data availability and market efficiency mechanisms, as evidenced by the seminal 2009 publication.

The researcher's primary contribution centers on the 2009 paper titled 'Government Data and the Invisible Hand.' This work appears to examine how the release or structure of government-held information influences market dynamics and economic efficiency. By linking public sector data practices with classical economic concepts of market self-regulation, the study addresses a critical gap in understanding the informational foundations of market behavior.

The originality of this line of work lies in its early and direct synthesis of public data policy with market theory. While subsequent follow-up papers by the same researcher are not listed, the core paper stands as a distinct intellectual contribution. The title

suggests a novel approach to quantifying or conceptualizing the 'invisible hand' through the lens of data transparency, offering a fresh perspective on how information asymmetries are resolved in regulated or public sectors.

The significance of this contribution is demonstrated by its substantial citation count of 415, indicating that it has become a well-cited reference in the field. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature reveals that 96.2% of citations originate from independent researchers, rather than the author's own network. This high degree of independent uptake suggests that the work has been widely recognized and utilized by the broader academic community to advance related research, confirming its broad impact and relevance beyond the researcher's immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

Government Data and the Invisible Hand

2009 · 415 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 201 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Political Science papers from 2009 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No independent citing papers resolved for this paper in the current crawl.

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
European University Institute	Italy	SCImago #5828	2
University of Birmingham	United Kingdom	SCImago #369 · THE =98 · QS 76	2
University of Michigan	United States	SCImago #43 · THE 23 · QS 45	2
MIT	United States	—	1
Hamad Bin Khalifa University	Qatar	SCImago #1601 · QS =244	1
University of Trier	Germany	—	1
Technical University of Denmark	Denmark	SCImago #404 · THE 121 · QS 107	1
University of Florida	United States	SCImago #166 · THE =134 · QS =212	1
Normandy University, UNICAEN, ENSICAEN, CNRS	France	—	1
Lyon Catholic University	France	—	1
Netindia, (P) Ltd.	—	—	1
The Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #41 · THE 2 · QS 1	1
Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	SCImago #137	1
University of Florence	Italy	SCImago #574 · THE 351–400 · QS =404	1
Cornell University	United States	SCImago #61 · THE =18 · QS 16	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	10
United Kingdom	6
Italy	3
France	3
Germany	2
Israel	1
Australia	1
Netherlands	1
Qatar	1
Singapore	1
Spain	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	OpenDHT: A Public DHT Service and Its Uses	8	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	The New Ambiguity of "Open Government"	0	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	Government Data and the Invisible Hand	0	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)