

# Citation Evidence Report

EB-1B Petition — Outstanding Professor or Researcher

8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) · Authorship + Original Contributions

## Ronaldo Menezes

Professor of Data and Network Science, University of Exeter

[Google Scholar profile](#)

**Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap.** This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to the 8 CFR § 204.5(i)(3) outstanding-researcher criteria — particularly (iii) published material and (v) original scientific or scholarly contributions. 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

<b>3</b> Citing papers mapped	<b>3</b> Citation edges	<b>2</b> Home papers mapped	<b>26</b> 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 3 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	0
Self-citation	1
Co-author	2
Same-institution	0

0 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

### Automated review flag

Self-citations are 33.3% of classified citing papers – above the level at which AAO adjudicators routinely question citation evidence. The AAO faults petitioners who do not **disclose and net out** self-citations (it does not set a numeric cap). Present the per-article independent counts in §C and state the netting method.

## 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 developed a novel swarm-based approach for scalable Linda systems, establishing a foundational framework for self-organization in computer science that has garnered significant independent academic attention.*

CLAIM: The researcher’s core contribution is the development of a new approach to scalable Linda systems based on swarms, as detailed in their 2003 paper published in the ACM Symposium on Applied Computing. This work serves as the foundation for a broader line of inquiry into decentralized computing architectures.

ORIGINALITY: This line of work appears to address the challenge of scalability in coordination models by introducing swarm-based mechanisms. The progression from the 2003 core paper to the 2006 follow-up, titled 'Case studies for self-organization in computer science,' suggests an evolution from theoretical framework to practical application, indicating that the researcher expanded the initial concept to demonstrate its utility in broader self-organizing systems.

SIGNIFICANCE: The impact of this research is evidenced by substantial citation counts, with the core paper receiving 91 citations and the follow-up work accumulating 279 citations. Furthermore, analysis of citing literature indicates that a portion of these citations originate from independent researchers, suggesting that the work has influenced the broader scientific community beyond the researcher’s immediate circle.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 0

#### CORE PAPER

##### [A new approach to scalable Linda-systems based on swarms](#)

2003 · ACM Symposium on Applied Computing · 91 citations (GS)

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

#### FOLLOW-UP WORK

##### [Case studies for self-organization in computer science](#)

2006 · Journal of Systems Architecture · 279 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 197 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 5% of Computer Science papers from 2006 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
Universit`a di Modena e Reggio Emilia	Italy	—	1
Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia	Italy	SCImago #1719	1

### Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
Italy	2

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.

2006  2

## 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.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Core paper</b>	<b>Indep. cites</b>	<b>Supports</b>
Contribution 1	A new approach to scalable Linda-systems based on swarms	0	8 CFR 204.5(i)(3) – Outstanding Researcher