Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Steven Goldfeder

Cornell Tech

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

7	7	1	23
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 7 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	7
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 foundational academic framework for Bitcoin and cryptocurrency technologies through a seminal, highly cited comprehensive introduction.

The researcher's primary contribution is the development of a comprehensive introductory framework for Bitcoin and cryptocurrency technologies, anchored by the 2016 publication 'Bitcoin and Cryptocurrency Technologies: A Comprehensive Introduction.' This work serves as the core reference point for this line of inquiry.

This line of work appears to address the need for a structured, academic synthesis of emerging cryptocurrency concepts. By providing a comprehensive introduction, the researcher likely filled a gap in formal educational resources, offering a consolidated view of the technology's underlying principles and applications during a period of rapid technological evolution.

The significance of this contribution is evidenced by its substantial citation count of 4,494, indicating widespread adoption as a standard reference. Furthermore, analysis of citing papers reveals that 100% of the classified citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting the work has achieved broad, field-wide recognition beyond the researcher's immediate institutional or collaborative network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 7

CORE PAPER

Bitcoin and Cryptocurrency Technologies: A Comprehensive Introduction

2016 · 4,494 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 1,152 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Computer Science papers from 2016 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Security and privacy on blockchain (2020)	Chinese Academy of Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology	China, United States	Background
2	Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion (2019)	Georgetown University, George Washington University, Johns Hopkins University	United States	—
3	Blockchain for healthcare systems: Architecture, security challenges, trends and future directions (2023)	Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences, Karunya University, Manipal Institute of Technology	India, Japan	—
4	Blockchain implementation for food safety in supply chain: A review (2024)	University of Guelph	Canada	—
5	Poisoning Web-Scale Training Datasets is Practical (2023)	ETH Zurich, Google, Google DeepMind	Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States	Background
6	Sustainable data analysis with Snakemake (2021)	Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Earle A Chiles Research Institute	Canada, Denmark, Germany	Background
7	The Convergence of Artificial Intelligence and Blockchain: The State of Play and the Road Ahead (2024)	Royal Thai Air Force Academy, University of South	Greece, Thailand, United States	—

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
		Alabama, University of the Aegean		

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
ETH Zurich	Switzerland	THE 11 · QS 7	1
Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics (SIB)	Switzerland	SCImago #523	1
German Cancer Consortium and German Cancer Research Center	Germany	—	1
University of Copenhagen Globe Institute	Denmark	—	1
University of Mainz	Germany	—	1
SIB Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics / ELIXIR Switzerland	Switzerland	—	1
Earle A Chiles Research Institute	United States	—	1
University of the Aegean	Greece	THE 1001–1200	1
Google	United States	—	1
University of South Alabama	United States	SCImago #5451 · QS 1201-1400	1
Royal Thai Air Force Academy	Thailand	—	1
Western University	Canada	THE 201–250 · QS 151	1
Chinese Academy of Sciences	China	SCImago #2	1
University Hospital Essen	Germany	—	1
George Washington University	United States	SCImago #832 · THE 201–250 · QS =358	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	5
Canada	2
Switzerland	2
United Kingdom	2
Greece	1
India	1
Japan	1
China	1
Thailand	1

Country	Citing papers
Denmark	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.

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	Bitcoin and Cryptocurrency Technologies: A Comprehensive Introduction	7	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)