



# International Journal of Innovative Research in Science Engineering and Technology (IJIRSET)

*(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)*



**Impact Factor: 8.699**

**Volume 14, Issue 3, March 2025**

# User Experience in Web2 vs. Web3 Gaming: A Comparative Study of UI Methodologies, Challenges, and Future Directions

Ms. Aditi Srivastava<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Gautam Singh<sup>2</sup>

U.G. Student, Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Parul University, Vadodara, Gujarat, India<sup>1</sup>

Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science & Engineering, Parul University, Vadodara, Gujarat, India<sup>2</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** The evolution of gaming has been significantly influenced by advancements in user interface (UI) and user experience (UX) design. Traditional Web2 games prioritize seamless interactions, centralized authentication, and structured monetization models, whereas Web3 games integrate blockchain-based mechanics such as decentralized ownership, tokenized economies, and smart contract-driven interactions. This paper explores the key differences between Web2 and Web3 game UI methodologies, comparing their onboarding complexity, transaction flow, earning models, security implications, and community engagement. While Web3 gaming introduces novel opportunities like play-to-earn (P2E) models and decentralized governance, it also presents UX challenges, including steep learning curves, wallet management, and gas fee complexities. This research highlights the current limitations of Web3 gaming UX, proposes potential hybrid solutions, and suggests future improvements to bridge the gap between traditional and decentralized gaming experiences.

**KEYWORDS:** Web2 Gaming UI, Web3 Gaming UI, UX Design, Blockchain Gaming, Play-to-Earn, User Interaction, Decentralization, Smart Contracts, Game Economy, Usability, Onboarding, Gamification, Digital Assets, Game Monetization.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The evolution of gaming interfaces has undergone significant transformations from traditional Web2-based platforms to the decentralized paradigm of Web3. User Interface (UI) and User Experience (UX) design play a crucial role in enhancing engagement, accessibility, and overall player satisfaction across both ecosystems. Web2 gaming UI follows established design principles aimed at intuitive usability, whereas Web3 introduces new complexities due to decentralization, blockchain integration, and player-owned assets [Abraham, 2023].

Web2 gaming UI/UX relies on centralized infrastructures where game developers and publishers control user data, in-game assets, and monetization models. Players interact with structured interfaces, benefiting from refined usability heuristics, seamless transactions, and standardized onboarding experiences [Venngren, 2021]. In contrast, Web3 gaming disrupts this model by integrating blockchain technologies such as smart contracts, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), and decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs). While these innovations provide increased player autonomy, they also introduce UI/UX challenges related to onboarding complexity, transaction finality, and security risks [Gao et al., 2024].

This research aims to analyze the UI methodologies employed in Web2 gaming and contrast them with the evolving design principles in Web3 gaming. By exploring factors such as onboarding complexity, transaction flow, monetization models, security considerations, and community governance mechanisms, this study will provide insights into the key differences and challenges of designing UI for decentralized gaming ecosystems [ZkNoid, 2023].

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### Web2 Gaming UI/UX Design

Web2 gaming UI is built on well-established principles of usability, accessibility, and structured user interactions. Traditional gaming interfaces prioritize smooth navigation, immediate feedback, and minimal cognitive load, aligning with standard usability heuristics. Key UI components, such as intuitive menus, HUDs (Heads-Up Displays), and guided



tutorials, significantly enhance player engagement and retention. Studies on user experience suggest that seamless onboarding and clear interface design directly impact player satisfaction and game longevity.

Monetization in Web2 games is primarily centralized, relying on in-app purchases, advertisements, and premium subscriptions. Research highlights that well-structured UI elements—such as frictionless checkout processes and engaging reward systems—play a crucial role in revenue generation while maintaining a positive user experience [Chen et al., 2020].

### Web3 Gaming UI/UX Design

Web3 gaming introduces decentralization, where players own and trade in-game assets through blockchain technology, NFTs, and smart contracts. Unlike Web2, where developers control assets, Web3 enables players to have verifiable ownership of their digital items. However, this shift also brings new UX challenges, including wallet integrations, gas fees, and complex onboarding. Many players find these additional steps frustrating, leading to lower adoption rates.

Security is another major concern in Web3 gaming. While Web2 games deal with issues like data breaches and account hacks, Web3 gaming must address smart contract vulnerabilities and phishing risks. Improving UI elements, such as clear transaction confirmations and better security education, has been suggested as a way to reduce user friction [Gao et al., 2024].

### Comparative Analysis: Web2 vs. Web3 Gaming UI

Existing studies compare Web2 and Web3 gaming UIs across various factors, including ease of onboarding, transaction complexity, and monetization models. The table below summarizes the key differences:

Aspect	Web2 Gaming UI	Web3 Gaming UI
Onboarding	Guided tutorials, quick start	Requires wallet setup, complex onboarding
Transactions	Instant payments, credit cards	Delayed due to blockchain finality, gas fees
Ownership	Developer-controlled assets	Player-owned NFTs and tokens
Security	Account security, centralized data risks	Smart contract risks, phishing threats
Earning Models	In-app purchases, ads	Play-to-earn, NFT trading

While Web3 gaming UI offers greater user autonomy, it currently faces usability and security challenges that hinder mainstream adoption. Researchers suggest that bridging the UX gap between Web2 and Web3 gaming will require simplified blockchain interactions, enhanced user guidance, and interoperable design frameworks [Liu & Martin, 2023].

## III. METHODOLOGY

This study analyzes the UI/UX design processes in Web2 and Web3 gaming environments by examining design frameworks, user behavior studies, and industry best practices. The methodology consists of two main approaches:

1. Web2 Game UI Methodology – Reviewing established UI design principles in traditional gaming.
2. Web3 Game UI Methodology – Investigating blockchain-based UI design challenges and opportunities.

### Web2 Game UI Design Methodology

The Web2 gaming UI design process follows a user-centered design (UCD) approach, ensuring that player needs drive interface development. This involves:

- User Research: Conducting surveys and usability tests to understand player expectations.
- Wireframing & Prototyping: Using tools like Figma or Adobe XD to create interactive layouts.
- Iterative Testing: Running A/B tests and gathering feedback to refine UI elements.
- Monetization Optimization: Implementing seamless in-app purchase flows and engagement loops to maximize retention.

Key frameworks like Jakob Nielsen's usability heuristics and the GameFlow model are applied to create intuitive gaming experiences [Nielsen, 1994].

### **Web3 Game UI Design Methodology**

Web3 gaming UI follows a blockchain-integrated UX design process, which includes:

- Onboarding Optimization: Simplifying wallet creation, private key management, and smart contract interactions.
- Transaction Transparency: Designing clear interfaces that display gas fees, transaction times, and confirmations.
- Decentralized Asset Management: Integrating NFT marketplaces and token swaps into the UI while ensuring ease of use.
- Security Considerations: Implementing anti-phishing measures, multi-signature authentication, and fraud detection.

Unlike Web2, Web3 game UI design prioritizes decentralization and player asset ownership, but this comes at the cost of increased complexity and friction in user interactions [Gao et al., 2024].

### **Comparative Methodology: Web2 vs. Web3 UI Design**

To compare the two methodologies, this study evaluates:

- Complexity of User Interactions (ease of onboarding, transaction flow).
- Security & Risk Factors (centralized vs. decentralized risk mitigation).
- Revenue Models (traditional monetization vs. play-to-earn structures).
- Usability Challenges (frictionless experience vs. blockchain hurdles).

A qualitative analysis of player behavior, combined with case studies of popular Web2 and Web3 games, forms the basis of this research.

## **IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF WEB2 AND WEB3 GAMING UI/UX**

### **User Experience & Onboarding**

Web2 games prioritize a frictionless onboarding experience, often featuring social logins, guided tutorials, and minimal initial setup. Players can start playing within seconds. In contrast, Web3 games require additional steps, such as:

- Creating or connecting a crypto wallet
- Understanding gas fees and transaction confirmations
- Managing private keys and security risks

Studies indicate that complex onboarding is one of the biggest barriers to Web3 gaming adoption [Liu & Martin, 2023]. While Web2's user-friendly design encourages mass adoption, Web3 gaming struggles with usability due to blockchain integration.

### **Complexity of Transactions & Interactions**

Web2 gaming transactions are instant and seamless, relying on traditional payment gateways (credit cards, in-app purchases, etc.). In contrast, Web3 gaming transactions involve:

- Smart contracts for in-game asset ownership
- Blockchain confirmations (which may take time)
- Gas fees, adding an unpredictable cost layer

This added complexity creates a steeper learning curve, making Web3 gaming less accessible to casual players [Gao et al., 2024].

### Monetization Models: Earning & Spending

Aspect	Web2 Gaming UI	Web3 Gaming UI
Revenue Model	In-app purchases, ads, premium content	Play-to-earn (P2E), NFT sales, staking
Player Spending	One-time purchases or subscriptions	Continuous investment in assets/tokens
Ownership	Developers own game assets	Players own tradeable NFTs and tokens

Web3 introduces a “Play-to-Earn” (P2E) model, allowing players to monetize their in-game time by selling NFTs or earning tokens. However, market fluctuations and speculative risks make earnings unpredictable [Chen et al., 2022].

### Security & Risks

Web2 security risks mainly include account hacks and payment fraud, while Web3 security risks extend to:

- Smart contract vulnerabilities (e.g., exploits, hacks)
- Phishing scams targeting wallets
- Loss of funds due to private key mismanagement

To mitigate these risks, Web3 UI/UX must simplify security measures by integrating multi-factor authentication, fraud detection, and user education [Brown & Singh, 2023].

### Accessibility & Adoption Challenges

Web2 gaming is accessible to anyone with an internet connection, whereas Web3 requires familiarity with blockchain technology. Key adoption barriers include:

- High entry costs (NFT-based games often require upfront investment)
- Regulatory uncertainty affecting game sustainability
- Lack of standardization in blockchain gaming platforms

While Web2 UI focuses on entertainment and immersion, Web3 UI demands financial literacy and technical knowledge, which limits its mainstream appeal.

Factor	Web2 Gaming UI	Web3 Gaming UI
Onboarding	Fast and simple	Requires wallet setup, complex for new users
Transactions	Instant purchases	Delayed due to blockchain processing
Security	Centralized protection	Smart contract risks, self-custody required
Earnings	Limited to developers	Players can earn via P2E, but risks exist
Adoption	Broad audience	Niche due to technical barriers

### Summary of Differences

## V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### The Trade-off Between Decentralization and Usability

One of the most significant findings is the inherent trade-off in Web3 gaming between decentralization and usability. Web3 gaming offers true digital asset ownership, but at the cost of increased complexity. Traditional Web2 games prioritize seamless user experiences, making them more accessible to the mass market.

Studies show that 80% of casual gamers are discouraged from Web3 gaming due to complex onboarding and crypto-related barriers [Garcia et al., 2023]. This suggests that for Web3 gaming to reach mainstream adoption, UI/UX designers must focus on minimizing friction in wallet creation, transactions, and security measures.

### Monetization: Sustainable Models in Web3 Gaming?

Web2 gaming monetization strategies (ads, in-app purchases, and premium models) have been refined over decades, ensuring predictable revenue streams for developers. However, Web3's Play-to-Earn (P2E) model introduces:

- High volatility: Token prices fluctuate, affecting player earnings.
- Economic instability: Many P2E models rely on continuous player investment, leading to unsustainable economies.

A study by Zhang & Patel (2024) highlights that 90% of Web3 gaming economies collapse within two years due to reliance on new player investments rather than intrinsic gameplay value. To improve sustainability, game developers must explore hybrid monetization models, integrating both Web2 and Web3 revenue strategies.

### Security Risks & User Trust

Web2 gaming platforms rely on centralized security protocols that protect users from fraud and hacks. In contrast, Web3 gaming shifts security responsibility to the user, increasing risks such as:

- Loss of private keys = loss of assets forever
- Smart contract vulnerabilities enabling exploits
- Phishing attacks on wallets

A report by Khan et al. (2023) found that over 40% of Web3 gaming security breaches in the past year resulted from poorly designed smart contracts. This raises concerns about whether decentralization is worth the increased security risks. Developers must improve UI/UX security features by:

- Implementing secure wallet integrations
- Enhancing fraud detection systems
- Offering educational UX elements to prevent user errors

### Adoption Barriers: How Can Web3 Gaming Attract the Mass Market?

For Web3 gaming to compete with traditional gaming, it must address key adoption barriers, including:

- Simplifying onboarding: Reducing wallet setup steps and integrating social logins with blockchain wallets
- Reducing gas fees: Utilizing Layer 2 scaling solutions to make transactions smoother and cheaper
- Enhancing game quality: Many current Web3 games focus more on earning mechanics than gameplay quality, deterring serious gamers

Recent research by Taylor et al. (2024) indicates that game quality is a more important factor than earnings potential for 65% of players deciding between Web2 and Web3 games. This highlights the need for Web3 game developers to prioritize engaging gameplay rather than financial incentives alone.

### The Future of Web3 Gaming UI/UX

The future of gaming UI/UX will likely involve a hybrid approach, integrating Web3 elements within Web2-like interfaces to balance user-friendliness and blockchain benefits. Potential advancements include:

- Invisible blockchain technology: Players interact with a traditional UI while blockchain processes run in the background
- Web2.5 gaming models: Games offering optional Web3 features instead of mandatory blockchain integration
- AI-driven UI optimization: Using machine learning to predict user behavior and personalize gaming experiences

As Web3 technology evolves, UI/UX innovations will play a critical role in making decentralized gaming more accessible, secure, and engaging.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

Gaming UI/UX has evolved significantly from Web2 to Web3, introducing new paradigms in decentralization, digital ownership, and monetization models. While Web2 games offer seamless onboarding, refined interfaces, and accessible gameplay, Web3 games introduce blockchain-based assets, player-driven economies, and decentralized control—but often at the cost of usability and security.

The comparison between Web2 and Web3 gaming highlights key contrasts:

- User Experience: Web2 gaming ensures smooth interactions, while Web3 gaming demands technical knowledge of wallets, transactions, and blockchain networks.
- Monetization Models: Play-to-Earn and NFT-based economies in Web3 bring financial opportunities but often struggle with sustainability, whereas Web2 monetization (ads, in-app purchases) is more established.
- Security & Accessibility: Web3 introduces irreversible transactions and smart contract vulnerabilities, creating barriers to mainstream adoption.
- Adoption Challenges: Many gamers hesitate to shift to Web3 due to complex onboarding, volatile asset values, and unclear long-term benefits.

For Web3 gaming to reach a broader audience, usability improvements, hybrid models, and stronger security measures are necessary. A seamless blend of Web2's accessibility with Web3's innovations could bridge the gap and enhance adoption.

## **VII. FUTURE WORK**

- Standardizing UI/UX frameworks to improve accessibility in Web3 gaming.
- Developing hybrid "Web2.5" models that integrate blockchain while maintaining Web2's ease of use.
- AI-driven UX improvements to personalize blockchain gaming experiences.
- Enhanced security mechanisms to mitigate risks associated with digital asset management.
- User adoption studies to track long-term trends and identify the best strategies for transitioning Web2 players into Web3 environments.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Brown, A., & Singh, R. (2023). **Enhancing Security Measures in Web3 Gaming Interfaces**. Journal of Blockchain Security, 12(3), 45-62.
2. Chen, L., Zhao, M., & Lee, K. (2022). **Economic Sustainability of Play-to-Earn Models in Blockchain Gaming**. International Journal of Game Studies, 8(4), 101-118.
3. Gao, Y., Patel, S., & Kim, H. (2024). **User Experience Challenges in Web3 Gaming Interfaces**. Proceedings of the International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, 15(2), 233-245.
4. Garcia, D., Nguyen, T., & Martin, E. (2023). **Barriers to Adoption in Blockchain-Based Gaming: A User-Centered Approach**. Computers in Entertainment, 19(1), 56-74.
5. Khan, R., & Lopez, J. (2023). **Smart Contract Vulnerabilities in Decentralized Gaming Platforms**. Blockchain Research Journal, 5(2), 88-102.
6. Liu, H., & Martin, E. (2023). **Onboarding Challenges in Web3 Gaming: A Comparative Study**. Journal of Digital Gaming, 14(3), 150-167.
7. Nielsen, J. (1994). **Usability Engineering**. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.
8. Taylor, S., & Johnson, M. (2024). **Game Quality vs. Earnings Potential: Factors Influencing Player Decisions in Web3 Gaming**. Entertainment Computing, 22(1), 34-50.
9. Zhang, W., & Patel, R. (2024). **Economic Instability in Play-to-Earn Gaming Models**. Journal of Virtual Economies, 7(2), 200-215.





INTERNATIONAL  
STANDARD  
SERIAL  
NUMBER  
INDIA



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  [ijirset@gmail.com](mailto:ijirset@gmail.com)



[www.ijirset.com](http://www.ijirset.com)

Scan to save the contact details