



IJRASET

International Journal For Research in
Applied Science and Engineering Technology



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 14 **Issue:** V **Month of publication:** May 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2026.82259>

www.ijraset.com

Call:  08813907089

E-mail ID: ijraset@gmail.com

A Comparative Analysis of Public Versus Private Blockchain Platforms for Academic Credential Verification

Kusum, Dr. Preeti

M.Tech Student, Assistant professor Department of Computer Science & Engineering, World College of Technology and Management Gurgaon, Haryana, India

ABSTRACT: *Some of the major challenges associated with academic credential verification comprise forging of certificates, slowness of manual credential verification and absence of data ownership. A decentralized and tamper-proof Blockchain technology is available, but institutions are uninformed on how to choose between a public or a private platform. The study performs a comparative study of the subject of public blockchain (Ethereum) vs. a Private blockchain (Hyperledger Fabric) in terms of scholarly credential authentication based on secondary analysis of existing literature on the topic dating 2018-2025. Five metrics of performance are analyzed: transaction throughput, latency, cost, security and scalability. Findings indicate that the private blockchains can far outperform the public blockchains by all metrics, and with 1000-3500 TPS (in contrast to 15-30 TPS), milliseconds latency (in contrast to seconds-minutes), negligible costs (in contrast to 0.50-50 per transaction), and more important scalability. Public blockchains are only beneficial to transparency but adversely affect privacy and performance. The results offer practical advice to institutions, suggesting that most academic credentialing uses should be done on private/ consortium blockchains.*

Keywords: *Blockchain, Academic Credential Verification, Public Blockchain, Private Blockchain.*

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Academic Credential Systems

Conventional systems of academic credentials have core databases, which are operated by institutions. Such systems have severe problems such as data corruption, malicious access, single point of failure, and lengthy verification systems. Forging of certificates is very common and the students do not own their records [1]. Employers face challenges in authenticating credentials, which creates an urgent necessity to have more secure and transparent means.

B. Overview of Blockchain Technology

Blockchain is a distributed registry of cryptographically recorded transactions over network nodes that are decentralized. Upon recording, data is not subject to any modifications without the unanimous decision of the data, thus it is immutable. Timestamps are used to connect transactions within each block to the last blocks [2]. Single authorities are removed by their decentralized nature, cryptographic security ensures unauthorized changes, and blockchain is suitable in use cases that need a sense of trust and openness.

C. Public vs. Private Blockchain Platforms

Public blockchains such as Ethereum are available to anyone, and are fully decentralized and transparent but have low throughput and high transaction costs. Permissioned blockchains like Hyperledger Fabric are private in nature, provide controlled access, quicker transactions and less expensive [3]. Their alternatives come at the trade-offs in the field of decentralization, performance, scalability, and privacy of academic credential management.

D. Problem Statement

The centralized academic record systems are prone to the breach of data, manipulation and delay in verification. There is no agreement on whether academic credentialing is best suited on the public or the private blockchain platform. Institutions do not provide a comparative analysis to help them choose the platform in terms of their needs that include security, cost, scalability, and performance [4]. This study fills in this gap, with a systematic comparison between the two types of blockchain.

E. Research Aim and Scope

The study seeks to carry out a comparative study of open and closed blockchain solutions to academic credential verification. This paper looks into Ethereum as a public blockchain implementation and Hyperledger Fabric as a private blockchain. The performance measurements involve the transaction throughput, latency, cost, security, and scalability [5]. The research is confined to the secondary analysis of the available literature in 2018-2025.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Centralized Academic Record Systems: Limitations




Figure 1: Single Point of Failure

(Source: <https://miro.medium.com>) Centralized systems keep academic records in one institutional database, making them susceptible to hacking, in-house abuse, and malfunctions in the systems. Confirmation can be done manually with an institution and employers which can also take weeks to be confirmed. Forging or forgery of certificates is so prevalent, because it is impossible to offer against tamper-proof assurance, when centralized architectures are concerned. Students do not have ownership and portability of data [6]. These restrictions indicate the inappropriateness of centralized systems in providing secure and effective credential management.

B. Blockchain for Academic Credential Verification




Figure 2: Zero-knowledge blockchain academic verification system (Source: <https://www.mdpi.com>)

Academic credentials can be stored on blockchain in a decentralized, immutable way. On-chain cryptographic hash of certificates guarantee verification without institutions by tampering. Smart contracts automated validation eliminating the verification time, which took days, to a few seconds [7]. Scientists have already shown blockchain-based prototypes that obtain a high degree of integrity and transparency, which can be considered a promising method to eradicate credential fraud and simplify authentication.

C. PublicBlockchainPlatforms: Ethereum-Based Solutions




Figure3:Ethereumblockchainnetwork architecture

(Source: <https://encrypted-tbn0.gstatic.com>) The most popular publicblockchainincredentialingofacademicisEthereum.The literatureindicatesthatEthereumoffersfull decentralizationandvisibilitybuthasalow transactionthroughput(15-30TPS)andhigh gascostswhenthereisnetworkcongestion(15-30 TPS) [8]. Studies have provided successful proof-of-concept deployments, and large universitieswiththousandsofcredentialsdaily find scalability a challenge.

D. PrivateBlockchainPlatforms: Hyperledger Fabric Solutions




Figure4:HyperledgerFabricBlockchain for Securing the Edge Internet of Things

(Source: <https://www.mdpi.com>) Hyperledger Fabric is a permissioned blockchain that provides easyaccess, a greater transaction throughput (up to 3500 TPS) and low transaction costs. Research shows that Fabric is better-suited to institutional applications because of data privacy settings, and regulatory requirements [9]. In Fabric, researchers have deployed academic record systems with much better performance and scalability than its public counterparts.

E. ComparativeStudiesonPublicvs. Private Blockchains

	Public Blockchain	Private Blockchain
Access	Anyone	Single Organization
Authority	Decentralized	Partially Decentralized
Transaction Speed	Slow	Fast
Consensus	Permissionless	Permissioned
Transaction Cost	High	Low
Data Handling	Full	Partial
Immutability	Read and Write access for anyone	Read and Write access for single organization
Efficiency	Low	High

Figure5: PublicVsPrivateBlockchain

(Source: <https://101blockchains.com>) There is a paucity of comparative studies directly pitting private against public blockchains with regard to academic credentials. The available literature suggests that permissioned blockchains are more efficient in terms of throughput and costs, whereas in the case of establishing the public blockchain better transparency and decentralization are granted. There is still no agreement regarding the best platform choice. The vast majority of comparisons are not empirical but based on ideas, which needs systematizing assessment.

F. Research Gaps Identified

The literature contains various gaps: none of the studies empirically compare public and private blockchains in academic credentialing; none of them offer formal performance indicators; none of them study corresponding costs and benefits analysis across different platforms; no one has guidelines on how to select a platform, depending on institutional needs; no one has properly validated scalability assertions. These gaps are tried to fill in this paper using systematic secondary analysis.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Type

In this study, a secondary analysis method is used, which involves systematic review and synthesis of literature on a particular topic in the form of peer reviewed journals, conferences, books and other credible sources found online. There are no major experiments and data gathering. This approach suits the comparison of the public and private blockchain platforms since it makes use of the already blended knowledge of the various studies to come up with holistic findings.

B. Data Collection Strategy

Information is gathered in online databases such as IEEE Xplore, SpringerLink, ScienceDirect, ACM Digital Library and Google Scholar. Keywords to be searched are: public blockchain, private blockchain, Ethereum, Hyperledger Fabric, academic credential verification and blockchain education [10]. Published material that date back to 2018-2025 are abstracted only to make the findings relevant and up to date.

C. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Sources that are included include peer-reviewed journals, conference papers, and authoritative books. Other sources that will not be included are non-peer-reviewed opinions, blog posts, cryptocurrency-only studies, and studies which do not explicitly consider blockchain in academic credentials. The number of sources to be analyzed is about 20-25. This guarantees quality and relevance of effects produced through synthesis.

D. Comparative Analysis Framework

The comparative scheme is implemented in a structured manner and looks at four aspects such as security properties, transaction cost structure, and scalability. Being compared to each other are public blockchain (Ethereum) and private blockchain (Hyperledger Fabric). All platforms are rated according to the same criteria so as to be fairly and systematically compared to each other in all the identified metrics.

E. Performance Metrics

This is performed using five performance indicators: transaction throughput (TPS), latency (verification time), transaction cost (gas fees or operational cost), security level (immutability and access control), and scalability (capability to support more users) [11]. These measurements are based on literature and offer quantitative and qualitative foundation on which platforms can be compared.

F. Ethical Considerations

All references are well cited to prevent plagiarism. Results are reported in a transparent manner with no preferential omission of evidence opposing the findings. There is no data creation and manipulation. Academic fair use is the use of copyrighted materials. This helps make the research remain intact and credible and adheres to ethical aspects in the process of secondary analysis.

IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

A. Transaction Throughput Comparison




Figure6:SuccessratesofHyperledger Fabric and Ethereum

(Source: <https://www.researchgate.net>) Ethereum and other public blockchain systems can handle about 15-30 transactions per second (TPS) and it cannot support large educational institutions that issue thousands of credentials each day. During network congestion, throughput is further reduced. In the case of private blockchain platforms such as Hyperledger Fabric 1000-3500 TPS is under the same condition. Higher acquisition volume of verification would cause high capacity academic institutions to be delayed heavily on the public blockchains. The throughput of the institutional workload with private blockchains is sufficient, thus they are more appropriate in large deployments [12]. This is a critical throughput upon which a platform can be selected by institutional size and volume of transactions.

B. Latency and Verification Speed




Figure7: Public Vs Private Blockchain

(Source: <https://101blockchains.com>) Public blockchain latency of verification can range between 15 seconds and several minutes based on network congestion and the cost in the form of gas fees. The verification of private blockchains requires milliseconds to seconds because of pre-authorized validators and no mining race. To check academic credentials, the results needed by the employer and the institution are almost instant [13]. Nanosecond verification is always achieved through private blockchains, whereas unacceptable delays are generated by public blockchains. Execution of smart contracts on Hyperledger Fabric takes 0.5-2 seconds to complete, whereas Ethereum takes 12-60 seconds to execute, which is evidently beneficial when it comes to permissioned platforms.

C. CostAnalysis




Figure8:Blockchainsvs.Conventional Remittance Transaction

(Source:<https://encrypted-tbn0.gstatic.com>) Transformingpublic blockchain consumes gas costsbetween0.5,and50ormoreinperiods ofhighload.Acceptinganannualissueof 10,000 credits, the institutions might spend up to \$5,000-500,000, which is costlyto afford in termsofmoneyinthecaseofapublic blockchain. In private blockchains, there is no transactiongasfee,theonlycostishosting, development of new infrastructure, and maintenance.Theaverageyearlycloudhosting costofHyperledgerfabricsisapproximately between5,000and20,000.Theconsortium modelsalsosavecostsastheyallowsharingof costs between more than two institutions [14]. In general, large-scale academic credentialing is economically infeasible using public blockchainsbecauseoftheirrandomhighcosts of doing transactions.

D. SecurityandImmutability Assessment

	Public Blockchains	Private Blockchains
Access level	o Anyone	o Single organization
Participation	o Permissionless o Anonymous	o Permissioned o Identities are known
Security	o Consensus mechanism o Proof of Work / Proof of Stake	o Pre-approved participants o Voting / multi-party consensus
Performance	o Slow transaction speed	o Lighter blockchain o Fast transaction speed

Figure9: Privatevs.Public Blockchains

(Source: <https://miro.medium.com>) Public blockchains are somewhat more decentralizedandtransparentwiththousandsof nodesauthenticatingthetransactions.Onceitis sure,thenimmutability.Nonetheless,thereis no assurance of data privacy as in all cases all transactions are visible publicly. Similarimmutabilitywithrestrictedaccessisavailableinprivateblockchains,anditsdataprivacy would be better in the case of student records. Security mechanisms rely on consensus: EthereumisbasedonProof-of-Work/Proof-of-StakeandHyperledgerFabricisbasedonpluggableconsensus[15].Bothofferdata protectioncontrolsbyensuringtamper-proof storage,althoughpermissionedaccesscontrols and optional data encryption allow the use of private blockchains to comply more with data protection regulations.

E. Scalability Evaluation

Property	Public Blockchain	Consortium Blockchain	Private Blockchain
Consensus determination	All miners	Selected set of nodes	One organization
Read permission	Public	May be public or restricted	May be public or restricted
Immutability	Almost completely tamper-proof	Potential for tampering	Potential for tampering
Efficiency	Low	High	High
Centralized	No	Partial	Yes
Consensus process	Permissionless	Permissioned	Permissioned

Figure 10: Comparison of public, consortium and private blockchains

(Source: <https://encrypted-tbn0.gstatic.com>) Public blockchains have high scalability constraints that linear transaction processing and block size imposes. Partial improvements come with a cost in layer-2 solutions which makes them more complex. Instead, private blockchains enhance their size through horizontal scaling, consisting of additional peer nodes and with an efficient consensus protocol. Hyperledger Fabric promotes the channel architecture that isolates transactions among particular network participants, which is effective in distributing workload. In the case of multi-institutional deployments across the universities, the scalability offered by the private blockchain consortia is better [16]. Without fundamental architectural modifications, the scale of a typical public blockchain to a national-scale academic credentialing system is impractical, which means that the only viable choice in implementing such systems is a private platform.

F. Summary of Comparative Findings

On all metrics considered, including throughput (3500 vs 30 TPS), latency (milliseconds vs minutes), cost (negligible vs \$0.50-50 per transaction) and scalability, private blockchains (Hyperledger Fabric) are better than public blockchains (Ethereum). Transparency of public blockchains is good; however, it comes at a cost of privacy and performance. In the case of institutional academic credential verification instant, these of private blockchains is evidently the best. The consortia might need the highest level of decentralization which is provided with public blockchains [17]. Choices of the platforms are based on institutional priorities: private to achieve efficiency and public to achieve transparency.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Interpretation of Key Findings

The findings clearly indicate that instead of the public blockchains, the private blockchains are better in performance with regard to throughput, latency, cost, and scalability when verifying academic credentials. This reaffirms that authorized techniques such as Hyperledger Fabric are more advantageous in institutional applications both technically and economically. University-scale level of transactions are impossible to process on public blockchains without incurring costs. On the other hand, decentralization and transparency are superior in the case of the public blockchains. The results indicate that the choice of the platform should be based on institutional priorities, and the use of the private blockchains are viable in most universities.

B. Comparison with Existing Literature

These results are consistent with other studies that supported the use of permissioned blockchains in education. But they go against initial research which argues in favour of public blockchains with the greatest transparency. Previous studies documented Ethereum-based systems that worked but noted the lack of scalability, which agreed with ours. The findings add value to the previous literature by offering direct quantitative comparison, which was not in previous studies. This synthesis contains conflicting claims, and this is resolved showing that the platform appropriateness is based on unique performance needs and not universal excellence.

C. Implications for Academic Institutions

Credential management at universities should be done on privately hosted or consortium blockchains, not on a public platform. Hyperledger Fabric provides adequate throughput, real-time validation, low costs and compliance by the regulation. The small institutions can also become members of consortium blockchains, to share the infrastructure costs [18].

Public blockchains are not advisable unless ultimate transparency is important over performance like in a multi-stakeholder consortium where a public auditability would be required. Before selecting a platform, institutions need to carry out a cost-benefit analysis on the basis of their volume of verification.

D. Trade-offs Between Public and Private Platforms

The critical trade-off is between transparency and performance and privacy. Public blockchains are fully decentralized but not fast, cost-efficient, and data protection. The private blockchains are cheaper and offer better performance; however, they do not rely on as many validators. In educational qualifications, confidentiality and effectiveness are of paramount importance, and confidential platforms are preferred. Halfway solutions involving both could be the best solutions, with the public certificate hashes being held on public blockchains and the private student data kept off-chain.

VI. LIMITATIONS

There are a number of limitations to this research. The research will follow a secondary research method where all the sources of existing literature are used. This synthesis inherits biases, methodological flaws or inaccuracies of original sources. Ethereum is only a representative of the public blockchain and Hyperledger Fabric is only a representative of the private blockchain, which does not allow a comparative analysis. Other platforms like Solana, Corda or Quorum were not investigated and might have different comparative outcomes. The absence of primary experimental validation will imply that the performance metrics used are considered to be based on various studies sharing different test conditions, network configurations, and evaluation methodologies. Inconsistencies in direct quantitative comparisons can be present. English-language articles published within 2018 through 2025 were taken into consideration, which might reject any non-English studies or studies containing foundations that are older. The speed of development of the blockchain technology implies that capabilities of platforms are being developed often. The adoption of Proof-of-Stake by Ethereum and the continuing innovations in layer-2 can change these performance aspects that are not fully reflected in this analysis. There was no real-world testing (institutional workloads) on live networks. The results are conclusions derived out of the literature, but no experimental verification is provided. It analyzed strictly on technical and economic indicators and not on the aspect of organizational change management, staff training needs, and factors of user adoption that have a considerable influence on the real-world implementation results. The limitations should be overcome by specific primary research in the future by empirical testing.

VII. FUTURE ENHANCEMENT

This comparative research can be expanded in a few ways that are outlined in the future. To begin with, it must be empirically tested with real-world application. In future research, both public and private blockchain implementation shall be applied on real university environments, where transactions throughput, latency, and cost analysis will occur as they happen, and the workloads of the institutions are in operation. This would give actual performance information as opposed to literature based comparisons. Second, it is suggested to expand to other blockchain platforms. In addition to Ethereum and Hyperledger Fabric, future studies would involve other publicly available platforms like Solana, Cardano, and Avalanche and some privately available platforms like Corda and Quorum. An expanded range of comparative analysis would be a complete guide to platform selection. Third, there is the need to develop a decision support model of institutions. An empirical research might result in a tool or matrix available to assist universities choose the most reasonable blockchain platforms according to their unique requirements: the number of students, the number of credits placed every year, financial limitations, privacy demands, and regulatory necessities. Fourth, a new direction to explore hybrid blockchain architecture has potential. Possible future study should develop and pilot systems that combine the advantages of both the public and private block chains where data on the anonymized certificate hashes stored in the public blockchain to be transparent but the private student data are stored in permissioned networks or off-chain storage of the data. The uncovered trade-off presented in this study is the inability of transparency and privacy to exist simultaneously. This hybrid solution would address this trade-off. Fifth, it should become connected with the new technologies. Using a combination of blockchain and zero-knowledge proofs would allow selective and non-disclosure of credentials without resulting in all of the student data being revealed. Portable ownership of credentials brought by integration with self-sovereign identities systems would provide students with cross-institutional ownership on their side. Interoperability standards to enable various blockchain platforms to communicate interchangeably should also be investigated. Sixth, five-to-ten years costs and benefits analysis would assist the institutions to comprehend the long-term economic issues. Lastly, user acceptance research on administrator, student and employer attitudes toward either public or private blockchain credentials would mitigate adoption challenges not discussed in this technical comparative.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This study made a comparative analysis of academically verifying credential blockchain through both a public and privately operated blockchain platform with Ethereum and a representative of a public blockchain and Hyperledger Fabric a representative of a privately operated blockchain. It identified five performance indicators, namely, transaction throughput, latency, cost, security, as well as scalability systematically evaluated through secondary analysis of current literature through 2018-2025. The results are quite evident, showing that the performance of private blockchains is significantly higher than that of public blockchain in the majority of metrics that can be related to institutional academic credentialing. Hyperledger Fabric has a throughput of 1000-3500 TPS against Ethereum throughput of 15-30 TPS and saves latency of verification which would otherwise take seconds or minutes. In contrast, the cost per-transaction of private blockchain is zero, whereas the gas costs per-transaction of a public blockchain lie between \$0.50 and \$50 and above, so massive scale deployment would be prohibitively expensive. Scalability: Private blockchains can achieve better scalability, with channel-based designs (and horizontal scaling). Public blockchains are only beneficial in terms of decentralization and transparency, in which all transactions can be publicly audited, but this transparency is incompatible with student data privacy concerns and regulatory and compliance requirements including GDPR. In the case of the credential management systems at most academic institutions, the best choice is a private/consortium blockchain. Transparency / performance-privacy is the root trade-off that determines which platforms to use, where organizations focus on efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and protection of personal data is better served by private blockchains, and multi-stakeholder consortia advantages are more important with public platforms. Hybrids, in which the hashes of certificates are posted publicly, but the students' data is kept privately, hold some bright future. This study clarifies contradictory assertions in the literature by showing that the platform suitability is a result of particular institutional demands and not universal preeminence, can be applied practically to guide universities, policymakers, and system designers, and requires future empirical verification and exploration of hybrids in advance of these findings.

REFERENCES

- [1] AlHemairy, M., Abu Talib, M., Khalil, A., Zulfiqar, A. and Mohamed, T., 2024. Blockchain-based framework and platform for validation, authentication & equivalency of academic certification and institution's accreditation: UAE case study and system performance (2022). *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(14), pp.18203-18232.
- [2] Nadeem, N., Hayat, M.F., Qureshi, M.A., Majid, M., Nadeem, M. and Janjua, J., 2023. Hybrid blockchain-based academic credential verification system (b-acvs). *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 82(28), pp.43991-44019.
- [3] Rustemi, A. and Dalipi, F., 2024, November. Academic certificate verification: A practical comparison between centralized and blockchain-based systems. In 2024 5th International Conference on Communications, Information, Electronic and Energy Systems (CIEES) (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- [4] Awang Abu Bakar, N.S., Yahya, N., Idris, N.B., Zakaria, Z. and Mohd Nordin, M.A., 2025. Enhancing Academic Credential Integrity Through Blockchain-Based Verification Systems. In *New Trends in Intelligent Software Methodologies, Tools and Techniques* (pp. 55-67). IOS Press.
- [5] Rustemi, A., Dalipi, F., Atanasovski, V. and Risteski, A., 2023. A systematic literature review on blockchain-based systems for academic certificate verification. *Ieee Access*, 11, pp.64679-64696.
- [6] KHAN, H., 2026. METAVERSE-BASED VIRTUAL EDUCATION PLATFORMS USING BLOCKCHAIN FOR CREDENTIAL VERIFICATION. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 104(4).
- [7] Rani, P., Sachan, R.K. and Kukreja, S., 2025. BT-CNV: A distributed and decentralized solution for certificate notarization and verification for academia using public blockchain. *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications*, 18(1), p.60.
- [8] Cuya, K.C. and Palaog, T.D., 2024. Blockchain in higher education: Advancing security, verification, and trust in academic credentials. *Nanotechnol. Percept*, 20, pp.373-386.
- [9] Silaghi, D.L. and Popescu, D.E., 2025. A systematic review of blockchain-based initiatives in comparison to best practices used in higher education institutions. *Computers*, 14(4), p.141.
- [10] Alsobhi, H.A., Alakhtar, R.A., Ubaid, A., Hussain, O.K. and Hussain, F.K., 2023. Blockchain-based micro-credentialing system in higher education institutions: Systematic literature review. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 265, p.110238.
- [11] Alsobhi, H.A., Alakhtar, R.A., Ubaid, A., Hussain, O.K. and Hussain, F.K., 2023. Blockchain-based micro-credentialing system in higher education institutions: Systematic literature review. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 265, p.110238.
- [12] Alsobhi, H.A., Alakhtar, R.A., Ubaid, A., Hussain, O.K. and Hussain, F.K., 2023. Blockchain-based micro-credentialing system in higher education institutions: Systematic literature review. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 265, p.110238.
- [13] Rani, P., Sachan, R.K. and Kukreja, S., 2024. Educert-chain: a secure and notarized educational certificate authentication and verification system using permissioned blockchain. *Cluster Computing*, 27(7), pp.10169-10196.
- [14] Any, B., Ramadhan, T. and Nabila, E.A., 2024. Decentralized academic platforms: The future of education in the age of blockchain. *Blockchain Frontier Technology*, 3(2), pp.112-124.
- [15] Berrios Moya, J.A., Ayoade, J. and Uddin, M.A., 2025. A zero-knowledge proof-enabled blockchain-based academic record verification system. *Sensors*, 25(11), p.3450.
- [16] Kabashi, F., Snopçe, H., Luma, A. and Neziri, V., 2024. Trustworthy Verification of Academic Credentials through Blockchain Technology. *International Journal of Online & Biomedical Engineering*, 20(9).



- [17] Sharwani, A.E. and Melo, R., 2024. Blockchain-enabled academic credential verification in the USA. *Adhyayan: A Journal of Management Sciences*, 14(02), pp.31-41.
- [18] Nousias,N.,Tsakalidis,G.,Michoulis,G., Petridou,S.andVergidis,K.,2022.Aprocess-aware approach for blockchain-based verification of academic qualifications. *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, 121, p.102642.



10.22214/IJRASET



45.98



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.129



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.429



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Call : 08813907089  (24*7 Support on Whatsapp)