Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Joe Neeman

Statistics, UC Berkeley

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

4	4	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 4 classified citing papers

Citation type	Count
Independent	4
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 resolved the Block Model Threshold Conjecture, a foundational problem in combinatorics, as evidenced by a seminal 2018 publication in Combinatorica with substantial independent scholarly uptake.

The researcher's primary contribution is the resolution of the Block Model Threshold Conjecture, established through the 2018 paper 'A Proof Of The Block Model Threshold Conjecture' published in Combinatorica. This work stands as a definitive result in the field, addressing a specific theoretical challenge without reliance on subsequent follow-up publications by the same author.

This line of work appears to address a critical gap in combinatorial theory by providing a rigorous proof for a long-standing conjecture. The title indicates a conclusive mathematical demonstration rather than an exploratory study, suggesting the researcher provided the missing logical framework necessary to validate the conjecture's validity within the broader context of graph theory or combinatorial structures.

The significance of this contribution is underscored by its high citation count of 442, indicating widespread recognition and utility within the academic community. Furthermore, the fact that 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers demonstrates that the work has been adopted and built upon by the broader scientific community, rather than being confined to the researcher's immediate circle or institution.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

A Proof Of The Block Model Threshold Conjecture

2018 · Combinatorica · 442 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 353 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Mathematics papers from 2018 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

No.	Citing paper	Citing institution(s)	Country	S2
1	Community Detection and Stochastic Block Models: Recent Developments (2018)	Princeton University	United States	—
2	Statistical physics of inference: Thresholds and algorithms (2016)	CNRS, PSL Universités, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Sorbonne Universités, Université Pierre & Marie Curie, Université Paris-Saclay	France	**Methodology**
3	Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models (2015)	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	Background
4	Exact Recovery in the Stochastic Block Model (2015)	New York University, Princeton University	United States	**Methodology**

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).

Citing-text excerpts — how the field used this work

METHODOLOGY Statistical physics of inference: Thresholds and algorithms

"The prediction and location of these phase transition in the stochastic block model from [59, 60] was followed by a remarkable mathematical development where the location of the threshold was made rigorous for q = 2 [158, 177, 178]."

METHODOLOGY Exact Recovery in the Stochastic Block Model

"...≥ Ω(√ log(n)/n) [5] Bickel, Chen '09 N-G modularity (p− q)/ √ p+ q = Ω(log(n)/ √ n) [32] Rohe, Chatterjee, Yu '11 spectral method p− q = Ω(1) While these algorithmic developments are impressive, we next argue how they do not reveal the sharp behavioral transition that takes place in this model."

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

Institution	Country	World ranking	Citing papers
Princeton University	United States	SCImago #386 · THE =3 · QS =25	2
Université Paris-Saclay	France	SCImago #235 · THE =68 · QS =70	1
New York University	United States	SCImago #116 · THE =31 · QS 55	1
CNRS, PSL Universités, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Sorbonne Universités, Université Pierre & Marie Curie	France	—	1
Carnegie Mellon University	United States	SCImago #266 · THE 24 · QS 52	1

Geographic distribution of citing authors

Country	Citing papers
United States	3
France	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	A Proof Of The Block Model Threshold Conjecture	4	Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned)