IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Machine Learning-Based Performance Optimization of Blockchain Networks

Dr. Anil Pandurang Gaikwad[1] and Prof. Krutika Balram Kakpure[2]
Assistant Professor, AISSMS College of Business Administration, Pune[1]
Assistant Professor, Master of Computer Applications[2]
Shalaka Foundation's Keystone School of Engineering, Pune, Maharashtra India
Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, Maharashtra
anilgaikwad2@gmail.com and krutika31.kakpure@gmail.com

Abstract: *Blockchain technology has emerged as an important foundation for decentralized applications, digital transactions, financial services, supply chain management, and distributed information systems. However, increasing transaction volumes, network congestion, computational overhead, and consensus-related delays continue to restrict blockchain performance. Traditional optimization techniques frequently depend on fixed configurations and predefined operational parameters, which may not adequately respond to changing network conditions. Machine learning (ML) provides opportunities to address these challenges through predictive analytics, intelligent resource allocation, adaptive consensus optimization, transaction scheduling, and anomaly detection. This study examines the role of machine learning in improving blockchain network performance through an analytical synthesis of existing academic literature. It investigates the relationship between ML techniques and major performance indicators, including transaction throughput, confirmation latency, computational resource utilization, energy consumption, scalability, and network reliability. A qualitative secondary research methodology is adopted, drawing upon academic publications and established blockchain benchmarking approaches. The comparative analysis identifies supervised learning, reinforcement learning, deep learning, and federated learning as relevant approaches for different optimization requirements. The analysis indicates that ML-based optimization can support more adaptive blockchain operations, although its effectiveness depends on data quality, computational overhead, network architecture, and security considerations. The study proposes an integrated optimization framework combining predictive workload analysis, intelligent parameter selection, protocol validation, and continuous performance monitoring. It concludes that machine learning can strengthen blockchain efficiency when implemented alongside appropriate decentralization, security, and governance mechanisms.*

Keywords: Blockchain Technology; Machine Learning; Performance Optimization; Reinforcement Learning; Consensus Mechanisms; Network Scalability; Transaction Throughput

I. INTRODUCTION

Blockchain technology has transformed the development of distributed digital systems by introducing decentralized transaction processing, cryptographic verification, distributed consensus, and immutable record management. Initially popularized through Bitcoin, blockchain has gradually expanded into financial services, healthcare, logistics, digital identity management, smart contracts, and Internet of Things (IoT) applications.

The principal advantage of blockchain lies in its ability to maintain a shared and verifiable transaction record without complete dependence on a centralized intermediary. Nevertheless, achieving reliable performance in decentralized environments remains a significant technical challenge. Unlike conventional centralized databases, blockchain

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

networks require participating nodes to communicate, validate transactions, execute consensus procedures, and maintain synchronized ledger information.

These operations introduce computational and communication overhead. As transaction volumes and network participation increase, blockchain systems may experience longer confirmation times, reduced throughput, higher storage requirements, and increased resource consumption. Such limitations are particularly important in applications requiring rapid transaction processing and continuous availability.

Traditional approaches to blockchain optimization generally involve modifying block size, adjusting block intervals, selecting alternative consensus mechanisms, increasing processing capacity, and implementing network-level improvements. Although these approaches can improve performance under particular conditions, static configurations may become inefficient when transaction demand, network bandwidth, node availability, and processing requirements change.

Machine learning provides an alternative approach by enabling blockchain systems to identify operational patterns, predict performance variations, and support data-driven decisions. Supervised learning can estimate transaction demand and network congestion. Reinforcement learning can identify suitable operational configurations through interaction with an environment. Deep learning can examine complex relationships among network parameters, while federated learning can facilitate collaborative model training without requiring unrestricted centralization of raw operational data.

However, optimization and decentralization must be considered together. Increasing transaction throughput should not automatically be treated as an improvement if it compromises security, validator participation, fault tolerance, or transaction finality. Performance optimization is therefore a multi-objective problem involving efficiency, security, reliability, decentralization, and operational cost. This study examines how machine learning techniques can contribute to blockchain performance optimization and develops an integrated conceptual framework for intelligent blockchain management.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Blockchain Technology and Performance Limitations

Zheng et al. (2018) provided a broad examination of blockchain architecture, consensus algorithms, applications, and technological challenges. Their survey identified scalability, privacy, security, and performance as important issues affecting blockchain adoption. It establishes the technical context for understanding blockchain limitations, although its primary focus is a general architectural survey rather than an integrated ML-based optimization framework.

Dinh et al. (2017) introduced BLOCKBENCH, a framework for analyzing private blockchain performance. Their work emphasized evaluating blockchain systems through dimensions such as throughput, latency, scalability, and fault tolerance. The contribution is important because it supports systematic and application-aware performance evaluation. However, benchmarking frameworks measure system behaviour; they do not themselves provide intelligent mechanisms for adapting operational configurations.

2.2 Consensus Mechanisms and Performance Optimization

Consensus mechanisms determine how distributed participants agree on transaction validity and ledger updates. Proof of Work relies on computational competition and can involve substantial energy requirements. Proof of Stake reduces dependence on energy-intensive mining but introduces validator-selection and economic-security considerations. Byzantine fault-tolerant approaches can support agreement among known participants under specified fault assumptions, although communication complexity may increase with network size.

The survey by Zheng et al. (2018) discusses the importance of consensus mechanisms in determining blockchain operational characteristics. More recent literature has considered how learning-based methods might support consensus configuration and monitoring. Such methods should be distinguished from unrestricted changes to consensus rules: adaptive mechanisms must preserve the security assumptions and protocol invariants of the underlying blockchain.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

2.3 Machine Learning for Adaptive Blockchain Optimization

Reinforcement learning is relevant to environments in which operational decisions influence future system behaviour. An agent observes a state, selects an action, and receives feedback through a reward function. In a blockchain context, the state could include transaction queue length, network bandwidth, CPU utilization, validator availability, and recent latency measurements. Actions might involve selecting among pre-approved configurations, adjusting transaction scheduling priorities, or changing resource allocation within protocol-defined boundaries.

Supervised learning can support prediction tasks such as workload forecasting, latency estimation, and resource-demand prediction. Deep learning may capture complex nonlinear and temporal relationships, although it generally requires sufficient data and computational resources. Federated learning may support collaborative model training across organizations without requiring all raw operational data to be transferred to a central repository. Each approach has limitations involving model generalization, training overhead, privacy, and security.

2.4 Machine Learning for Scalability Enhancement

Rebello et al. (2024) reviewed blockchain scalability solutions spanning hardware-level improvements and Layer-2 protocols. Their analysis highlights payment channels, rollups, congestion control, and network design strategies. It demonstrates that scalability cannot be addressed exclusively through consensus changes. Machine learning may complement these techniques by predicting congestion, estimating transaction demand, and supporting routing or resource-scheduling decisions. However, a predictive model cannot independently remove fundamental protocol bottlenecks.

2.5 Performance Benchmarking and Workload Analysis

Mazzoni et al. (2022) presented a performance evaluation methodology for permissioned blockchain networks using ConsenSys Quorum, Hyperledger Caliper, and Docker. Their work emphasizes reproducible evaluation and the importance of comparing consensus algorithms under clearly specified configurations.

Wang et al. (2024) introduced BlockLoader, a performance evaluation framework for Hyperledger Fabric that considers workload patterns, endorsement policies, and dynamic node behaviour. This work reinforces the importance of workload distribution and network configuration when interpreting performance. It also illustrates why evaluations based only on fixed transaction rates may not represent real operating conditions.

Table 1: Comparative Assessment of Previous Research

Researcher(s)	Research focus	Contribution	Limitation / boundary
Dinh et al. (2017)	Blockchain benchmarking	BLOCKBENCH performance evaluation	Primarily measurement-oriented
Zheng et al. (2018)	Blockchain architecture	Analysis of technological challenges	Limited focus on adaptive ML optimization
Mazzoni et al. (2022)	Permissioned blockchain performance	Quorum performance evaluation	Platform- and configuration-specific
Rebello et al. (2024)	Blockchain scalability	Hardware and Layer-2 solutions	Primarily architectural focus
Wang et al. (2024)	Workload-sensitive benchmarking	BlockLoader evaluation framework	Focused on Hyperledger Fabric

Taken together, the literature shows a progression from performance benchmarking and architectural analysis toward adaptive, data-driven management. It also suggests that machine learning should complement established architectural and benchmarking methods rather than replace them.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

3.1 Research Questions

- How can machine learning techniques contribute to improving blockchain network performance?
- Which machine learning approaches are suitable for optimizing transaction throughput and confirmation latency?
- How can predictive analytics and intelligent resource allocation improve blockchain scalability?
- What security, computational, and decentralization challenges arise from integrating machine learning into blockchain networks?
- What integrated framework can support adaptive and reliable blockchain performance optimization?

3.2 Research Hypotheses

The following propositions are developed for future empirical testing. They are not presented as statistically validated findings in this secondary research study.

H1: Machine learning-based workload prediction is positively associated with the operational efficiency of blockchain networks.

H2: Reinforcement learning-based adaptive parameter selection has the potential to improve transaction throughput and reduce confirmation latency under changing network conditions.

H3: Intelligent resource allocation is positively associated with blockchain network scalability and resource efficiency.

H4: The effectiveness of machine learning-based blockchain optimization is influenced by network security, model reliability, and decentralization requirements.

IV. RESEARCH GAP

4.1 Limited integration of optimization dimensions. Several studies examine individual indicators such as throughput, latency, consensus efficiency, or resource consumption. A broader approach is needed to examine how these indicators interact within a unified optimization framework.

4.2 Limited cross-platform evaluation. Results demonstrated on one platform may not transfer to another because consensus mechanisms, execution environments, transaction models, and network architectures differ.

4.3 Dynamic workload adaptation. Fixed workloads may not capture unpredictable transaction demand and changing network conditions. Further work is needed on systems that adapt to realistic workload variation.

4.4 Security-aware optimization. Learning systems may be exposed to manipulated training data, adversarial inputs, model poisoning, and unsafe operational decisions. These risks require explicit treatment.

4.5 Decentralized learning and governance. Centralized model training may conflict with distributed governance principles. Federated and privacy-preserving learning require further investigation.

4.6 Limited evidence of integrated long-term performance. Reproducible evaluations are needed to test sustained improvements across network sizes, workloads, failures, and adversarial conditions.

This study responds to these gaps by proposing a conceptual framework connecting predictive workload analysis, adaptive decision-making, resource optimization, protocol validation, and security monitoring.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

This research adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical secondary research design. It examines existing academic publications to understand how machine learning can support blockchain performance optimization. A secondary approach is appropriate because the principal objectives are to synthesize evidence, compare approaches, identify limitations, and develop an integrated conceptual framework. The research does not claim to conduct original blockchain experiments or collect primary participant data.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

5.2 Research Approach

A qualitative analytical approach is used to examine relationships among machine learning techniques, blockchain architecture, consensus mechanisms, network performance indicators, resource utilization, and security and decentralization requirements.

5.3 Sources of Data

The study draws on peer-reviewed journal articles, conference publications, academic research on blockchain scalability, machine learning and reinforcement learning studies, and established blockchain benchmarking documentation. The literature includes foundational studies and more recent publications available through the coverage period considered for this paper.

5.4 Literature Selection Criteria

Publications were considered relevant when they addressed blockchain performance or scalability, consensus mechanisms, ML-based optimization, reinforcement learning, benchmarking, throughput, latency, resource utilization, or security in distributed systems. The selection was purpose-driven rather than an exhaustive systematic review. No complete PRISMA screening process or database-wide search count is claimed.

5.5 Primary and Secondary Data

No primary data were collected. The study did not conduct surveys, interviews, laboratory experiments, or direct blockchain measurements. Secondary material consists of previously published academic findings, documented performance-evaluation methods, and established conceptual discussions. The findings therefore represent analytical conclusions from existing evidence rather than independently measured experimental outcomes.

5.6 Analytical Techniques

The analysis uses thematic synthesis to organize studies by recurring themes; comparative analysis to assess the suitability of different learning approaches; conceptual framework development to connect prediction, decision-making, resource management, and monitoring; and critical assessment to consider security, model generalization, computational overhead, and decentralization.

5.7 Proposed Machine Learning Optimization Framework

The proposed framework contains five interconnected layers:

Layer 1: Data acquisition. Collect operational information from blockchain nodes, transaction pools, network monitoring systems, and resource monitors. Variables may include transaction arrival rate, queue length, block interval, confirmation time, CPU and memory utilization, bandwidth, validator availability, and failed transaction rate Wang, G at al (2024).

Layer 2: Predictive analytics. Apply suitable models to estimate future network conditions. Candidate algorithms include Random Forest, Gradient Boosting, Support Vector Regression, LSTM networks, and other time-series methods. The purpose is to predict demand, resource requirements, and potential congestion.

Layer 3: Intelligent decision-making. Use reinforcement learning or other optimization methods to evaluate available operational configurations. Decisions may concern approved transaction-scheduling policies, resource allocation, protocol-permitted configurations, or congestion-management actions. This layer must not bypass protocol security or unilaterally alter consensus rules.

Layer 4: Performance optimization. Implement approved decisions through the blockchain management infrastructure to improve throughput, latency, resource efficiency, and reliability while respecting security and decentralization constraints.

Layer 5: Monitoring and feedback. Continuously evaluate actual performance, compare it with predicted performance, and use the resulting information to update the learning process. Monitoring should include rollback or safe-mode procedures when model behaviour becomes unreliable.

5.8 Proposed Framework Representation

The proposed architecture can be represented as the following sequence:

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

- Blockchain network
- Operational data collection
- Data processing and feature extraction
- Machine learning prediction
- Intelligent decision-making
- Security and protocol validation
- Approved performance optimization
- Performance monitoring and feedback loop

This framework is a proposed conceptual model, not an experimentally validated software implementation.

Table 2: Performance Evaluation Indicators

Indicator	Measurement	Optimization objective
Transaction throughput	Successful transactions per second	Improve processing capacity
Confirmation latency	Time to defined confirmation or finality	Reduce transaction delays
CPU utilization	Percentage of processor usage	Improve computational efficiency
Memory utilization	Memory consumption	Reduce unnecessary overhead
Network utilization	Bandwidth and communication traffic	Improve communication efficiency
Energy consumption	Energy used over a defined period	Improve energy efficiency
Transaction success rate	Successful transactions relative to submitted transactions	Improve reliability
Scalability	Performance under increasing workload and network size	Maintain acceptable performance

Indicators should be measured under comparable experimental conditions. Throughput alone is insufficient to establish that one blockchain configuration is superior.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Analytical Overview

The secondary literature indicates that blockchain performance is determined by interactions among consensus protocols, transaction workloads, network communication, computational resources, and application requirements. Machine learning offers an opportunity to improve system adaptability by identifying operational patterns and supporting data-driven decisions. Benefits depend on data quality, algorithm suitability, and security restrictions imposed by the blockchain architecture.

6.2 Machine Learning and Transaction Throughput

When transaction arrival rates exceed processing capacity, pending queues may increase, resulting in congestion and delayed confirmation. Supervised learning models can examine historical transaction patterns to predict periods of increased demand. A model trained on arrival rates, temporal patterns, and resource utilization may estimate future processing requirements. These predictions can support proactive resource allocation and transaction scheduling.

Reinforcement learning may provide additional benefits by evaluating the effects of permitted configurations under changing workload conditions. However, throughput improvement is not guaranteed merely by introducing an ML model. Network communication, consensus coordination, and transaction execution remain fundamental constraints.

6.3 Reduction of Transaction Latency

Latency is influenced by transaction validation, network propagation, block production, consensus communication, and finality requirements. Machine learning may reduce avoidable delays by identifying congestion patterns and supporting

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

intelligent scheduling. Predictive models may estimate periods of high demand and recommend resource allocation. Anomaly-detection models may identify unusual delays caused by network disruptions or node degradation.

Transaction prioritization must be governed by transparent rules. An optimization system should not create unfair treatment or compromise consensus validity. Transaction inclusion time and finality time should be reported separately because they represent different operational conditions.

6.4 Consensus Mechanism Optimization

Different consensus mechanisms involve different assumptions concerning participant identity, communication complexity, computational resources, and fault tolerance. Machine learning can support consensus-related optimization by predicting network conditions, identifying resource bottlenecks, supporting selection among pre-approved configurations, predicting workload effects, and identifying abnormal validator behaviour Zheng, Z at al (2018).

Intelligent consensus management is a promising research direction, but consensus safety must remain a protocol-level requirement rather than a variable that an unconstrained learning model can override.

6.5 Intelligent Resource Allocation

Blockchain nodes require computational and communication resources for transaction verification, execution, consensus, and ledger maintenance. Uneven allocation can produce bottlenecks. Models can predict node requirements using historical CPU utilization, memory consumption, transaction volume, and communication patterns. Predictions may support workload distribution, processing-resource allocation, overloaded-node identification, capacity planning, and energy-aware infrastructure management.

Intelligent resource allocation is particularly relevant to permissioned networks where infrastructure management can be coordinated among participating organizations. In public networks, optimization requires additional care because unequal allocation can influence participation and decentralization.

6.6 Scalability and Dynamic Workload Management

Blockchain networks must accommodate changes in transaction volume and participating nodes. Rebello et al. (2024) explain that scalability involves architectural dimensions including Layer-2 protocols and network design. Wang et al. (2024) demonstrate the importance of evaluating performance under varying workload patterns rather than relying exclusively on fixed transaction rates.

A predictive optimization system could estimate future demand and support selection of suitable operational configurations. When demand increases, the system could recommend additional permitted processing capacity or congestion-management strategies; when demand decreases, it could recommend resource adjustments. Scalability nevertheless depends on architecture, and ML-based scheduling cannot independently eliminate protocol-level throughput limitations.

Table 3: Comparison of Machine Learning Techniques

ML technique	Potential application	Main advantage	Main limitation
Random Forest	Workload and congestion prediction	Handles nonlinear relationships in structured features	Temporal dependencies may require feature engineering
Gradient Boosting	Latency and resource prediction	Strong predictive modelling capability	Requires careful tuning and monitoring
Support Vector Regression	Performance estimation	Useful for structured prediction problems	May be difficult to scale to very large datasets
Deep Learning	Complex transaction and network patterns	Learns complex representations	Higher data and computational requirements
LSTM	Time-series workload forecasting	Models sequential dependencies	Training and generalization challenges

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

Reinforcement Learning	Adaptive parameter selection	Learns through interaction and feedback	Reward design and safe exploration are difficult
Federated Learning	Collaborative model training	Reduces need to centralize raw data	Communication and aggregation overhead

No single algorithm is suitable for every blockchain optimization problem. Selection should depend on the performance objective, data availability, computational resources, and operational risk.

6.8 Security and Reliability Considerations

Machine learning introduces risks into blockchain management. A model trained on manipulated data may generate incorrect predictions, while attackers may attempt to influence observations or exploit weaknesses in automated decisions. Other concerns include adversarial input manipulation, training-data poisoning, privacy leakage, unauthorized policy changes, dependence on centralized model infrastructure, and failure to generalize under unexpected conditions Castro, M., at al. (1999).

Security validation should therefore be integrated into the optimization framework. High-impact decisions should remain subject to predefined protocol constraints, authorization mechanisms, independent monitoring, and safe rollback procedures. Federated learning may reduce the need to transfer raw operational data, but it does not automatically eliminate privacy or poisoning risks.

6.9 Comparative Discussion of Existing Research

Dinh et al. (2017) and Mazzoni et al. (2022) emphasize structured performance evaluation. Rebello et al. (2024) extend the discussion to architectural scalability and Layer-2 solutions. Wang et al. (2024) demonstrate why realistic workload patterns and dynamic node behaviour matter when evaluating performance. Collectively, these contributions indicate that performance optimization should combine accurate benchmarking, architectural improvements, intelligent prediction, and controlled adaptive decision-making.

6.10 Proposed Multi-Objective Optimization Model

Blockchain optimization can be represented as a multi-objective problem. A conceptual objective function is:

$$\textbf{Maximize } F = w_1T - w_2L - w_3C - w_4E$$

where T represents transaction throughput, L represents transaction latency, C represents computational resource consumption, E represents energy consumption, and w_1, w_2, w_3, and w_4 are non-negative weighting parameters. The model is subject to security, decentralization, fault-tolerance, and protocol-compliance constraints. Weights depend on the application context: a financial settlement network may prioritize security and finality, whereas an IoT application may emphasize energy and processing efficiency. This formulation is conceptual and does not represent an empirically estimated optimization function.

VII. CONCLUSION

Machine learning-based performance optimization represents a promising direction for improving the efficiency and adaptability of blockchain networks. The growing application of blockchain across financial services, healthcare, supply chains, digital identity, and IoT has increased the need for scalable, reliable, and resource-efficient distributed systems. Transaction congestion, consensus overhead, communication delays, and computational resource requirements nevertheless remain important challenges.

The literature examined indicates that machine learning can contribute through workload prediction, adaptive configuration, intelligent resource allocation, anomaly detection, and performance monitoring. Supervised learning is useful for predictive tasks, deep learning can support complex pattern recognition, reinforcement learning offers opportunities for adaptive operational decisions, and federated learning can facilitate collaborative model development.

These techniques also have limitations involving training requirements, computational overhead, data reliability, security vulnerabilities, and model generalization. The study therefore proposes an integrated five-layer framework involving data acquisition, predictive analytics, intelligent decision-making, performance optimization, and continuous monitoring.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 7, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

A central conclusion is that machine learning should complement blockchain architecture and established consensus protocols rather than replace their security and governance foundations. Effective optimization must balance performance improvements with security, decentralization, transparency, and operational reliability.

REFERENCES

1. Dinh, T. T. A., Wang, J., Chen, G., Liu, R., Ooi, B. C., & Tan, K.-L. (2017). BLOCKBENCH: A framework for analyzing private blockchains. In Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data (pp. 1085–1100). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3035918.3064033
2. Mazzoni, M., Corradi, A., & Di Nicola, V. (2022). Performance evaluation of permissioned blockchains for financial applications: The ConsenSys Quorum case study. Blockchain: Research and Applications, 3(1), Article 100026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcra.2021.100026
3. Rebello, G. A. F., Camilo, G. F., de Souza, L. A. C., Potop-Butucaru, M., de Amorim, M. D., Campista, M. E. M., & Costa, L. H. M. K. (2024). A survey on blockchain scalability: From hardware to layer-two protocols. IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, 26(4), 2411–2458. https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2024.3376252
4. Wang, G., Zhang, Y., Ying, C., Zhang, Q., Peng, Z., Li, X., & Yu, G. (2024). BlockLoader: A comprehensive evaluation framework for blockchain performance under various workload patterns. Mathematics, 12(21), Article 3403. https://doi.org/10.3390/math12213403
5. Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H.-N., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2018). Blockchain challenges and opportunities: A survey. International Journal of Web and Grid Services, 14(4), 352–375. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWGS.2018.095647
6. Hyperledger. (n.d.). Hyperledger Caliper: Blockchain performance benchmarking framework. Linux Foundation Decentralized Trust. https://github.com/hyperledger-caliper/caliper
7. McMahan, B., Moore, E., Ramage, D., Hampson, S., & Aguera y Arcas, B. (2017). Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* (Vol. 54, pp. 1273–1282). Proceedings of Machine Learning Research.
8. https://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/mcmahan17a.html
9. Wang, G., Zhang, Y., Ying, C., Zhang, Q., Peng, Z., Li, X., & Yu, G. (2024). BlockLoader: A comprehensive evaluation framework for blockchain performance under various workload patterns. *Mathematics, 12*(21), Article 3403. https://doi.org/10.3390/math12213403
10. Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H.-N., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2018). Blockchain challenges and opportunities: A survey. *International Journal of Web and Grid Services, 14*(4), 352–375. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWGS.2018.095647
11. Castro, M., & Liskov, B. (1999). Practical Byzantine fault tolerance. *Proceedings of the Third Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, 173–186. https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi-99/practical-byzantine-fault-tolerance