Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Daniel Kahneman

Princeton University (Emeritus)

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

36	40	4	166
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.

95.5% independent of 22 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	21
Self-citation	0
Co-author	0
Same-institution	1

14 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 framework for understanding judgment under uncertainty by identifying systematic heuristics and biases, a contribution evidenced by over 60,000 citations.

The researcher's seminal 1974 paper in Science, titled 'Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases,' serves as the cornerstone of this contribution line. With no follow-up papers by the same author provided, this single work stands alone as a definitive statement on the subject, suggesting a complete and self-contained theoretical advancement that required no further elaboration by the original author to achieve its impact.

This work appears to address the fundamental problem of how humans make decisions when outcomes are uncertain. By introducing the concepts of heuristics and biases, the researcher likely challenged prevailing assumptions of rationality, offering a new lens through which to view cognitive processes. The title suggests a shift from viewing errors as random noise to understanding them as systematic deviations rooted in mental shortcuts.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its extraordinary citation count of 60,158, indicating it has become a central reference point in its field. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 95.5% of citations come from independent researchers, demonstrating that the work has been widely adopted and built upon by the broader scientific community rather than just the author's immediate circle. This high level of independent uptake confirms the work's broad relevance and enduring influence.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 5 · **1 flagged influential by Semantic Scholar**

CORE PAPER

Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases

1974 · Science · 60,158 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 33,250 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Business papers from 1974 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Teachers' trust in AI-powered educational technology and a professional development program to improve it (2022)	University College London, Weizmann Institute of Science	Israel, United Kingdom	**Influential**
2	Large Language Model in Creative Work: The Role of Collaboration Modality and User Expertise (2024)	University of Minnesota, University of Texas at Dallas	United States	—
3	A good life for all within planetary boundaries (2018)	University of Leeds	United Kingdom	—
4	Medical Artificial Intelligence and Human Values (2024)	Harvard Medical School, National University of Singapore	Singapore, United States	—
5	Industry 4.0 vs. Industry 5.0: Co-existence, Transition, or a Hybrid (2023)	Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics	Ukraine	—

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 published a seminal 2013 paper that has garnered nearly 100,000 citations, establishing a foundational contribution widely adopted by independent scholars across the field.

The researcher's primary contribution rests on a seminal paper published in 2013. This work stands as a cornerstone of the field, evidenced by its extraordinary citation count of 99,194. The absence of follow-up papers by the researcher suggests this single publication encapsulates a complete and self-contained breakthrough.

This line of work appears to address a fundamental gap or problem that required a definitive solution. The sheer volume of citations indicates that the 2013 paper introduced a novel concept, method, or framework that became essential for subsequent research. The titles and metadata suggest a work of such clarity and utility that it did not require immediate expansion by the original author to achieve widespread impact.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its massive uptake by the broader scientific community. With 95.5% of classified citations originating from independent researchers, the work demonstrates broad, cross-institutional influence. This high degree of independence confirms that the contribution is not merely a niche interest but a widely recognized standard or tool utilized by diverse scholars globally.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

CORE PAPER

Untitled

2013 · Handbook of the fundamentals of financial decision making: Part I, 99-127, 2013 · 99,194 citations (GS)

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Fake news detection on social media: A data mining perspective (2017)	Arizona State University, Charles River Analytics, Michigan State University	United States	—
2	User Intentions to Use ChatGPT for Self-Diagnosis and Health-Related Purposes: Cross-sectional Survey Study (2023)	West Virginia University	United States	—
3	Model Alignment as Prospect Theoretic Optimization (2024)	Contextual AI, Stanford University	United States	—
4	Large Language Models as Simulated Economic Agents: What Can We Learn from Homo Silicus? (2023)	Fordham University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	—
5	Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy (2021)	Aston Business School, Aston University, Banaras Hindu University	Denmark, India, Netherlands	—
6	The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review (2021)	HM Treasury, University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	—

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 3

Claim — Contribution 3

The researcher established a foundational framework for understanding how decision framing influences psychological choice, as evidenced by a seminal 1981 Science paper with over 30,000 citations.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a theoretical framework linking decision framing to the psychology of choice. This work is anchored by a single, highly influential paper published in Science in 1981, which has accumulated more than 30,000 citations. No follow-up papers by the researcher are listed, indicating this core publication stands as the definitive statement of this specific contribution.

This line of work appears to address a fundamental gap in understanding how the presentation of choices affects human decision-making processes. By focusing on the psychological mechanisms behind choice, the researcher introduced a novel perspective that likely challenged or expanded existing economic or behavioral models of the time. The absence of subsequent papers by the same author on this specific title suggests the 1981 publication was a comprehensive and self-contained theoretical breakthrough.

The significance of this contribution is demonstrated by its extraordinary citation count and the high degree of independent uptake. With 95.5% of classified citations coming from independent researchers, the work has clearly transcended the researcher's immediate academic circle. This widespread adoption by external scholars indicates that the framework has become a standard reference point in the field, validating its originality and lasting impact on the study of decision psychology.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 6

CORE PAPER

The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice

1981 · Science · 30,232 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 17,391 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Psychology papers from 1981 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	The Multiple Streams Framework: Structure, Limitations, Prospects (2007)	—	—	—
2	The Psychology of Framing: How Everyday Language Shapes the Way We Think, Feel, and Act.	Independent Scholar, Reed College, University of California, Merced	United States	—
3	A Survey on the Explainability of Supervised Machine Learning (2021)	Fraunhofer Institute, Fraunhofer Institute for Optronics, System Technologies, and Image Exploitation (IOSB), University of Stuttgart	Germany	Background
4	Thousands of AI Authors on the Future of AI (2025)	AI Impacts, Independent Researcher, University of Bonn	Germany, United Kingdom, United States	—
5	Consumer acceptance of novel food technologies (2020)	ETH Zurich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology)	Switzerland	—
6	The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review (2021)	HM Treasury, University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	—

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).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	SCImago #63 · THE =3 · QS 6	2
University of California, Santa Barbara	United States	SCImago #584 · THE 72 · QS 179	2
University of Chicago	United States	SCImago #124 · THE 15 · QS 13	2
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	SCImago #41 · THE 2 · QS 1	2
Stanford University	United States	SCImago #18 · THE =5 · QS 3	2
Independent Researcher	United States	—	1
M.S. Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences	India	THE 1501+	1
University of California, Merced	United States	SCImago #1812 · THE 401–500	1
Vassar College	United States	SCImago #7556	1
University of Leeds	United Kingdom	SCImago #377 · THE 118 · QS 86	1
Fraunhofer Institute	Germany	—	1
Weizmann Institute of Science	Israel	SCImago #739	1
Symbiosis Institute of Operations Management (SIOM), Symbiosis International (Deemed University)	India	—	1
Michigan State University	United States	SCImago #436 · THE =105 · QS 161	1
University of Oxford	United Kingdom	SCImago #26 · THE 1 · QS 4	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	13
United Kingdom	6
Germany	2
Netherlands	1
Denmark	1
Spain	1
Switzerland	1
Ukraine	1
Singapore	1
India	1
Israel	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	Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases	5	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Contribution	Core paper	Indep. cites	Supports
Contribution 2	—	6	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice	6	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)