

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Robert Cartwright

Professor of Computer Science, Rice University

[Google Scholar profile](#)

Generated 2026-06-10 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

1	1	5	29
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.

0.0% independent of 1 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	0
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 introduced foundational concepts in soft typing, establishing a seminal framework that has garnered significant academic attention through over 400 citations.

The researcher's primary contribution centers on the introduction of soft typing, as detailed in a seminal 1991 paper. This work stands as the core pillar of this specific line of inquiry, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the researcher identified in the provided data to extend or modify the initial framework.

This line of work appears to address fundamental challenges in type systems by proposing a flexible approach distinct from rigid static typing. The 1991 publication suggests an early and influential attempt to balance type safety with programming convenience, establishing a conceptual baseline that subsequent research in the field has referenced.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its citation count of 435, indicating that the work has been widely recognized and utilized within the academic community. While the provided data does not specify the independence of the citing researchers, the volume of citations suggests that the researcher's framework has become a standard reference point for scholars exploring type system design.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

[Soft typing](#)

1991 · 435 citations (GS)

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

Contribution 2

Claim – Contribution 2

The researcher established a foundational semantic framework for program dependence, providing a rigorous theoretical basis for understanding data and control flow relationships in software systems.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a formal semantic model for program dependence, as articulated in the seminal 1989 paper 'The semantics of program dependence.' This work serves as the cornerstone of the researcher's portfolio in this domain, standing alone without subsequent follow-up publications by the same author.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests a shift toward rigorous formal semantics in the analysis of program structure. By focusing on 'semantics' rather than just syntactic properties, the work appears to address the need for a deeper, mathematically grounded understanding of how program elements influence one another. This approach likely provided a novel theoretical lens for analyzing code behavior that was distinct from earlier, less formal methods.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 165 citations, the paper demonstrates sustained academic interest and utility within the field. However, the citation analysis reveals that 0.0% of citing papers are from independent researchers, indicating that the work's impact has been primarily confined to the researcher's immediate academic circle or institution. While the citation count confirms the paper's status as a recognized reference, the lack of independent uptake suggests limited broader dissemination or adoption by the wider scientific community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

[The semantics of program dependence](#)

1989 · 165 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 119 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 10% of Computer Science papers from 1989 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 developed a practical soft type system for Scheme, introducing a novel approach to static type inference that balances expressiveness with implementation feasibility in dynamically typed languages.

CLAIM: The researcher's primary contribution is the design of a practical soft type system for Scheme, as detailed in their 1997 paper. This work stands as a singular, foundational piece in their portfolio, with no subsequent follow-up papers by the same author building directly upon this specific line of inquiry.

ORIGINALITY: The title suggests an effort to bridge the gap between dynamic flexibility and static safety in Scheme. By labeling the system as 'practical,' the researcher appears to have addressed the challenge of implementing soft typing in a way that is usable and efficient, rather than purely theoretical. The absence of follow-up papers indicates this was a self-contained solution to a specific problem in language design.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 137 citations, the paper has achieved notable recognition within the field, indicating that the proposed system influenced subsequent research or implementation efforts. However, the citation analysis reveals that none of the citing papers are from independent researchers, suggesting the impact may be concentrated within the researcher's immediate academic circle or institution rather than broadly adopted by the wider community.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

CORE PAPER

[A practical soft type system for Scheme](#)

1997 · 137 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 146 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Computer Science papers from 1997 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
Indiana University	United States	THE =198	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	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.

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	Soft typing	0	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 2	The semantics of program dependence	0	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)
Contribution 3	A practical soft type system for Scheme	0	Dhanasar – Prong 2 (well-positioned)