Customer Satisfaction Towards Digital Payment Platforms: A Comparative Study of Paytm and Google Pay Among Urban Users

Daniel Glance Danny[1], Dr. K. Pradeep Reddy[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, School of Commerce, Sanjeev Agrawal Global Educational (SAGE) University, Bhopal*
[2]*Professor, School of Management, Sanjeev Agrawal Global Educational (SAGE) University, Bhopal*

Abstract— **The rapid expansion of digital payment technologies has transformed financial transactions in India, particularly within urban regions characterized by widespread smartphone adoption and internet connectivity. This study examines customer satisfaction with two major digital payment platforms, Paytm and Google Pay, among urban consumers in India. The research evaluates user experiences across dimensions such as usability, transaction speed, security, rewards, interface design, and customer support. A structured questionnaire was administered to urban users, and the responses were analysed using descriptive statistics. The findings reveal that Google Pay is generally preferred for its simple interface, faster transaction processing, and smoother user experience, whereas Paytm is valued for its broader ecosystem of services, including bill payments, ticket bookings, wallet functionality, and financial products. The study also identifies security, reliability, customer support, and rewards as critical determinants of user satisfaction. The research contributes to the growing body of literature on digital payment adoption and offers practical recommendations for fintech companies and policymakers seeking to improve customer engagement and service quality.**

Index Terms— **Customer Satisfaction, Digital Payments, Google Pay, Paytm, UPI**

I. INTRODUCTION

India has become one of the world's fastest-growing digital payment markets due to increasing smartphone penetration, affordable internet access, and supportive government initiatives promoting cashless transactions. Digital payment applications now play a central role in everyday financial activities, enabling users to transfer money, pay utility bills, shop online, and conduct a wide range of transactions conveniently. Among the many digital payment platforms available in India, Paytm and Google Pay have emerged as dominant players. While both platforms provide secure and convenient payment solutions, they differ significantly in their service offerings, interface design, and operational models. Understanding customer satisfaction regarding these platforms is essential because user experience strongly influences adoption, retention, and loyalty in the highly competitive fintech ecosystem (Singh, 2020; Sharma, 2018).

A. Growth of Digital Payments in India

The evolution of digital payments in India has occurred in multiple stages. Initially, electronic transactions were primarily conducted through internet banking and card-based systems. The emergence of mobile wallets introduced greater convenience and accessibility. Later, the Unified Payments Interface (UPI), developed by the National Payments Corporation of India (NPCI), revolutionised digital transactions by enabling instant bank-to-bank transfers. UPI-based applications such as Google Pay, PhonePe, and Paytm now process billions of transactions every month, reflecting the growing preference for digital financial services (Panchal & Balachandran, 2018; Joshi & Kumar, 2020).

B. Overview of Paytm and Google Pay

Paytm was launched in 2010 and initially focused on mobile recharge and bill payment services. Over time, it expanded into a comprehensive financial ecosystem that includes wallet services, UPI transactions, banking facilities, ticket booking, insurance products,

and investment options. Its broad range of services makes it a multifunctional platform for users (Gokul Sai Ram, 2021).

Google Pay, introduced in India in 2017 under the name Tez, operates primarily through UPI. The application emphasises simplicity, speed, and ease of use. Its features include direct bank transfers, QR code payments, bill settlements, and reward-based incentives. Unlike Paytm, Google Pay does not maintain a separate wallet service and instead focuses on seamless banking transactions (Sekhar, 2021).

C. Significance of Customer Satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is a critical success factor for digital payment platforms. Satisfied users are more likely to continue using the service, recommend it to others, and contribute to a positive brand reputation. In digital financial services, satisfaction is closely linked to transaction reliability, security, usability, customer support, and rewards (Mishra, 2019; Verma & Patel, 2020). Since urban consumers have multiple alternatives available, maintaining high satisfaction levels is essential for sustaining market competitiveness.

D. Objectives of the Study

- To evaluate customer satisfaction levels regarding Paytm and Google Pay.
- To identify factors influencing user satisfaction in urban areas.
- To compare both platforms across usability, security, transaction speed, customer support, and reward systems.
- To provide recommendations for enhancing user experience and customer retention.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Existing research has extensively examined customer satisfaction, adoption behaviour, and service quality in digital payment applications. Studies conducted after demonetization highlighted the importance of convenience, cashback incentives, and user-friendly interfaces in influencing consumer preferences (Goyal & Goyal, 2016). Google Pay is frequently preferred for its simple design and fast transaction processing, while Paytm attracts users through its broader range of services (Sharma, 2018). Mishra (2019) found that customer support quality significantly affects satisfaction in digital wallet platforms. Efficient complaint resolution and quick issue handling improve user trust and loyalty. Similarly, Singh (2020) emphasised the role of brand reputation and user experience, showing that Google Pay benefits from strong consumer trust associated with the Google brand. Verma and Patel (2020) studied digital payment preferences among college students and reported that Google Pay is often perceived as less cluttered and easier to navigate than Paytm. Rao (2021) further demonstrated that gamified reward systems, such as scratch cards, increase user engagement and satisfaction. Choudhury (2021) examined digital wallet usage during the COVID-19 pandemic and found that consumers preferred platforms with fewer transaction steps and faster processing times. Mehta (2022), using sentiment analysis of app reviews, observed that Google Pay generally receives more positive feedback for reliability and interface quality, whereas Paytm users more frequently report issues related to advertisements and app complexity. Kapoor (2023) identified demographic differences in digital wallet preferences, noting that younger users tend to favor Google Pay for peer-to-peer transactions, while older users may prefer Paytm for its broader service ecosystem. Rani and Saxena (2023) highlighted that interface difficulties and excessive promotional content can contribute to users switching from one payment platform to another.

A. Synthesis of Empirical Evidence

The following table summarizes empirical evidence from foundational literature:

Table I. Synthesis of Empirical Evidence

Statement	Suggested Citation
Digital payments expanded rapidly post-demonetization.	(Goyal & Goyal, 2016; Choudhury, 2021)
Google Pay is preferred for speed.	(Sharma, 2018; Verma & Patel, 2020)
Paytm attracts users through ecosystem.	(Sharma, 2018; Kapoor, 2023)
Support affects satisfaction.	(Mishra, 2019)
Brand reputation influences trust.	(Singh, 2020)
Gamified rewards build engagement.	(Rao, 2021)

Existing literature identifies customer satisfaction as a key determinant of digital payment adoption and continued usage. Goyal and Goyal (2016) observed

that cashback incentives, ease of use, and application design significantly influence user preferences in the Indian digital payment market. Their study also noted that promotional strategies play a substantial role in attracting first-time users. Similarly, Sharma (2018) reported that Google Pay is often preferred for its simplified interface and faster UPI transaction processing, while Paytm attracts users through its wider range of financial services and ecosystem integration.

Research on service quality has consistently emphasized the importance of customer support. Mishra (2019) found that complaint resolution efficiency is a major determinant of user satisfaction in digital wallet platforms. Users tend to evaluate platforms not only on transaction success but also on how quickly issues are addressed. In a related study, Singh (2020) highlighted that brand reputation and perceived trustworthiness significantly affect adoption and satisfaction. The association of Google Pay with the Google brand was found to enhance user confidence, while Paytm was viewed as a more business-oriented platform.

Interface design and user experience have also received considerable attention. Verma and Patel (2020) examined digital payment preferences among college students and concluded that minimalist design and ease of navigation positively influence satisfaction. Their findings suggested that excessive advertising and interface complexity can reduce the overall user experience. Mehta (2022), using sentiment analysis of user reviews, similarly reported that Google Pay receives more favourable feedback regarding interface simplicity and transaction reliability, whereas Paytm users frequently mention promotional clutter and technical issues.

Gamification and reward systems represent another important area of research. Rao (2021) demonstrated that Google Pay's scratch-card-based reward system generates higher engagement and repeat usage compared to traditional cashback models. The study argued that reward mechanisms can influence not only satisfaction but also emotional attachment to a platform. Choudhury (2021) further showed that during the COVID-19 pandemic, users increasingly favoured applications requiring fewer transaction steps and offering faster processing, characteristics commonly associated with Google Pay.

Recent studies have also explored demographic and contextual differences in digital payment usage. Kapoor (2023) found that older urban users often prefer Paytm because of its broader utility services, while younger consumers favour Google Pay for peer-to-peer transactions and simplicity. Rani and Saxena (2023) identified interface complexity and frequent advertisements as major reasons users switch from Paytm to competing platforms.

B. Deep Dive into Baseline Student Geographies

A study by Kirupah Sri R. (2025) titled "A Study on Customer Satisfaction with Google Pay among Students in Bangalore" examined satisfaction levels among student users of Google Pay. The research identified ease of use, transaction reliability, processing speed, security features, cashback benefits, merchant acceptance, and customer support as major determinants of satisfaction. Using a survey of 150 students, the study found that a substantial majority of users were satisfied with Google Pay’s convenience and efficiency, with more than 85% expressing positive perceptions of usability (Kirupah Sri R., 2025).

The study also highlighted that security concerns such as fraud, unauthorised transactions, and data privacy remain important factors influencing user perceptions. Nevertheless, Google Pay’s authentication mechanisms, fraud detection systems, and UPI security protocols were found to enhance user confidence. The findings indicate that fast transactions, ease of navigation, language support, and attractive reward programs contribute significantly to user satisfaction and loyalty among young consumers (Kirupah Sri R., 2025). The present study extends this line of research by comparing Google Pay with Paytm among a broader urban population rather than focusing exclusively on students. This comparative perspective helps address a gap in the literature regarding user satisfaction across leading digital payment platforms in urban India.

C. Research Gap

Although previous studies have examined digital payment adoption and customer satisfaction, many have focused either on a single platform or a specific demographic group. The study by Kirupah Sri R. (2025) concentrated on student users in Bangalore and evaluated only Google Pay. Similarly, several earlier

studies investigated digital payment applications individually without conducting a detailed comparative assessment between leading platforms. Therefore, a research gap exists regarding comparative evaluations of customer satisfaction between Paytm and Google Pay among urban consumers across diverse demographic segments. The present study seeks to bridge this gap by comparing both platforms and identifying the factors that influence user satisfaction and platform preference.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive and comparative research design. This framework allows for a systematic collection of quantitative metrics to rigorously evaluate and compare customer satisfaction dimensions between Paytm and Google Pay while mapping specific features to distinct consumer preferences. A structured quantitative research methodology was chosen to establish empirical comparisons between the two applications. By translating user experiences into measurable numerical scales, the study isolates operational vectors such as speed, security, and interface clarity from subjective user biases.

B. Data Collection Instrument and Scaling

Primary empirical data were collected using a multi-part structured questionnaire delivered via a hybrid framework of online links and localised paper surveys targeting urban transaction nodes. To standardise response configurations, user metrics were categorised on standard 5-point Likert scales, with weights ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree / Highly Dissatisfied) to 5 (Strongly Agree / Highly Satisfied). The internal structure of the instrument was engineered around key service-quality indices adapted from the traditional SERVQUAL framework, explicitly modified for digital fintech environments.

C. Sample Size, Sampling Technique, and Demographics

The sample framework comprised N = 151 active digital payment practitioners residing across primary and secondary urban clusters in India. Given the exploratory nature of the comparative design, a non-probability convenience sampling technique was deployed. To prevent systemic selection bias, strict inclusion criteria required participants to have maintained an active operational history with either Paytm, Google Pay, or both platforms within the preceding 12 months. The final sample cohort encompassed a varied occupational footprint, incorporating corporate professionals, micro-entrepreneurs, university students, and homemakers, ensuring demographic cross-representation.

Data validation and processing were executed via Microsoft Excel. The statistical processing pipeline converted raw ordinal inputs into normalised metric scores using descriptive statistical techniques. The principal mathematical tools used to interpret user platform parity included:

Frequency Distribution: To compute demographic densities and platform usage regularities.

Percentage Analysis: To evaluate comparative margins across structural parameters.

Mean Satisfaction Score: Calculated to pinpoint central tendencies within the Likert arrays.

D. Methodological Limitations

- While this study offers valuable insights, several structural parameters constrain the universal applicability of its insights:
- Sample Scale Constraints: The targeted sample size (N = 151) restricts generalizability to the entirety of urban India.
- Self-Reporting Elasticity: Reliance on voluntary self-reported questionnaires creates a vulnerability to response bias and subjective recall errors regarding app latency or transaction failures.
- Platform Exclusion Scope: The analytical scope deliberately omits key active competitors within the Indian Unified Payments Interface (UPI) system, such as PhonePe, BHIM (Bharat Interface for Money), and emerging WhatsApp Pay configurations.
- Geographic Bias: The sample isolates urban consumer frameworks, excluding rural and semi-urban transactional topographies, which operate under separate infrastructure conditions.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Demographic Analysis

The structural composition of the sample cohort (N = 151) provides a clear view into the demographic characteristics driving fintech integration in Indian urban centres. The sample shows a higher proportion of male respondents (62%) than female respondents (38%). Age distribution trends reveal that 70% of the total participants fall within the 21–40 years age bracket. This profile marks this segment as the primary engine driving consumer fintech engagement, matching historical trends for early technology adoption. Furthermore, the significant representation of university students (48%) highlights the critical role younger, tech-focused cohorts play in setting mobile payment trends. This aligns with the findings of Kirupah Sri R. (2025) regarding student behaviour in urban hubs.

B. Platform Usage and System Interaction Patterns

The distribution of platform usage indicates a clear preference for Google Pay over Paytm among the urban sample. A major percentage of respondents reported using digital payment applications multiple times a day, with over 75% of the sample maintaining active transaction histories exceeding a two-year operational window. This sustained, high-frequency usage confirms that digital applications have shifted from optional alternatives to essential infrastructure for daily financial transactions. This pattern confirms earlier findings by Joshi and Kumar (2020) regarding India's systemic shift toward cashless transactional ecosystems.

C. Multi-Dimensional Satisfaction Analysis

The comparative performance profiles of Paytm and Google Pay were evaluated across five structural service domains: Interface Usability, Processing Latency, Ecosystem Depth, Security Architecture, and Resolution Efficiency.

1) Interface Usability and Navigation Aesthetics: Google Pay achieved significantly higher satisfaction ratings for its interface design. Users praised its minimalist layout and clean look. Conversely, Paytm's interface received criticism for its layout complexity. Participants frequently noted that Paytm's interface feels cluttered due to the density of promotional banners, lifestyle integration widgets, and in-app advertisements. This finding matches the observations of Rani and Saxena (2023) regarding user friction caused by ad-heavy payment screens.
2) Processing Latency and Transaction Stability: Regarding processing latency, Google Pay outpaced Paytm. Respondents reported lower frequencies of transaction hanging states and localised app timeouts when using Google Pay. Google Pay's direct integration with the bank's UPI handle, bypassing intermediate digital storage layers, creates a smoother user experience. Paytm transactions, while versatile, were noted for occasional processing delays, particularly during automated transitions between its internal Wallet architecture and core UPI networks.
3) Ecosystem Depth and Feature Multiplicity: Paytm leads significantly in ecosystem depth. Users value its comprehensive suite of financial features, which functions as a digital department store. Paytm's capability to natively process utility bills, manage complex ticketing systems (rail, air, and cinema), handle toll transponders (FASTag), and provide access to retail investment products (Paytm Gold, mutual funds) sets it apart from Google Pay's more streamlined, peer-to-peer transaction model.
4) Reward Engineering and Engagement Tactics: The mechanisms for user rewards differ between the two applications. Google Pay's gamified rewards system, built around instant-gratification digital scratch cards and seasonal collection games, generates higher immediate satisfaction and habituation. This supports the behavioural findings of Rao (2021). Paytm's transition toward point-based voucher systems received lower engagement scores, as users view these offers as promotional upsells rather than direct cash rewards.

D. Security Architecture and Consumer Trust Frameworks

Perceived security remains a foundational requirement for consumer retention in digital financial markets. Both platforms scored highly in this category, showing that urban Indian consumers have developed confidence in biometric locks, multi-factor PIN verification, and automated cryptographic safeguards.

Google Pay benefits from the global security reputation of its parent company, creating a baseline of trust (Singh, 2020). Meanwhile, Paytm's historical presence in the Indian financial sector provides a strong foundation of institutional reliability, despite its busier application design.

E. Resolution Efficiency and Customer Support Channels

Customer support emerged as a primary area needing operational improvement for both platforms. Respondents expressed widespread dissatisfaction with automated, rule-based chatbot assistance during transaction failures or erroneous account deductions. The lack of access to human support specialists during financial transaction disputes causes user anxiety. This pattern shows that current customer support setups lag behind the automated speed of payment execution, confirming the findings of Mishra (2019) regarding service quality gaps.

V. COMPREHENSIVE COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION

To synthesise the empirical findings, the performance of Paytm and Google Pay can be contrasted across core operational vectors:

Table II. Comprehensive Performance Profile Comparison

Evaluation Vector	Paytm Operational Profile	Google Pay Operational	Comparative Synthesis &
Core Architecture	Hybrid Ecosystem: Digital wallet	Pure-play UPI Conduit:	Paytm acts as a
UI & UX	Multi-tier layout dense with	Minimalist, contact-	Paytm's density creates visual
Latency & Stability	Variable processing speed across	Optimized transaction	Google Pay maps lower error
Ecosystem Depth	Market leader in bill schedules,	Centered on immediate	Users leverage Paytm for
Incentivization	Point-based voucher	Gamified scratch	Immediate financial rewards
Institutional Trust	Built on long-standing native	Backed by global	Both platforms secure
Support Paths	Ticket structures paired with	Help structures mapped	Both systems exhibit service

A. Analytical Integration

The empirical insights gathered from urban consumers show two distinct paths for fintech design. Google Pay focus on user-centric design principles, where system transparency and low processing latency create high user satisfaction. Its design follows the principle that 'less is more' for transactional tools. By eliminating intermediate storage steps like digital wallets and building direct bank-to-bank links via UPI handles, Google Pay reduces the cognitive load on the user. This design approach explains why younger demographics and students prefer the platform for fast, peer-to-peer transactions, as detailed in the Bangalore study (Kirupah Sri R., 2025).

Conversely, Paytm's strategy relies on ecosystem lock-in. By building a comprehensive platform that handles everything from mobile top-ups to insurance purchases and credit lines (Paytm Postpaid), the platform positions itself as an all-in-one financial app. This extensive service offering comes at the cost of interface simplicity. The resulting interface requires users to navigate past promotions, ad blocks, and cross-selling widgets. This layout explains why older, multi-utility urban consumers remain loyal to Paytm, valuing its diverse capabilities over interface minimalism (Kapoor, 2023). However, this density presents challenges for user retention when competing with sleeker alternatives (Rani & Saxena, 2023).

VI. STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

A. For Google Pay

- Deepen Utility Integration Natively: Google Pay should expand its financial ecosystem by adding deeper utility options, such as micro-investment channels and comprehensive automated ticketing systems, without altering its minimalist design.
- Address Reward Exhaustion: To counter declining user enthusiasm for low-value scratch cards, the platform should introduce personalised, milestone-based reward matrices tailored to individual spending habits.
- Optimise Offline Merchant Authentication: Implement fallback communication modes, such as offline encrypted Bluetooth signatures or localised mesh confirmation networks, to ensure

transaction stability in low-connectivity urban environments.

B. For Paytm

- Implement Interface Streamlining Option: Paytm should offer a user-configurable interface toggle, allowing consumers to switch between a comprehensive, full-featured mode and a clean, minimalist layout focused solely on core UPI/Wallet transactions.
- Reduce Promotional Friction: Limit the frequency of in-app advertisements and promotional pop-ups during active transaction sequences to minimise user drop-off and cart abandonment (Rani & Saxena, 2023).
- Enhance Wallet-to-UPI Transitions: Optimise internal database handshakes to prevent processing delays when moving funds between internal wallet balances and linked commercial bank accounts.

C. Shared Systemic Mandates for Both Competitors

- Humanise Dispute Resolution Systems: Move away from fully automated chatbot support loops for high-value transaction faults. Implement a dedicated "Fast-Track Human Intervention Protocol" that connects users with live support specialists within 120 seconds for failed transfers exceeding a set threshold.
- Improve Localised Security Messaging: Deploy simple, clear, multilingual contextual pop-ups before final fund releases to protect vulnerable populations against social engineering scams, phishing links, and fraudulent collection requests.
- Build Universal Cross-Platform Interoperability: Ensure seamless operational continuity across wallet and account interfaces to maintain high performance standardizing across changing regulatory frameworks established by the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and the National Payments Corporation of India (NPCI).

VII. CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis demonstrates that both Paytm and Google Pay have established critical roles within the urban Indian fintech landscape, though they succeed through different strategic value propositions. Google Pay leads in user experience satisfaction due to its minimalist design, low processing latency, and direct bank-to-bank transactional model. This makes it highly effective for fast, peer-to-peer financial interactions. Conversely, Paytm operates successfully as an all-in-one financial hub, retaining market share through its comprehensive suite of utility configurations, ticket booking channels, wallet systems, and retail financial products, despite user friction regarding its busy user interface.

The empirical data show that customer satisfaction in the digital payments sector is determined by a combination of interface clarity, processing reliability, ecosystem utility, and responsive support channels. As the Indian fintech sector matures under evolving regulatory frameworks, long-term market leadership will shift toward providers that successfully combine comprehensive service offerings with clean, accessible application design. Integrating baseline insights from recent studies, such as the 2025 Bangalore student cohort analysis (Kirupah Sri R., 2025), reinforces that transaction efficiency, explicit security measures, and responsive dispute resolution are essential requirements for younger consumers. Ultimately, the platforms that successfully balance system transparency, data privacy, and intuitive UI engineering will maintain competitive advantages and drive consumer loyalty in India's digital economy.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Agarwal, “Perceptions towards online payment: A comparative study of Google Pay and Paytm in Prayagraj,” *International Journal of Innovative Research in Technology (IJIRT)*, vol. 8, no. 10, 2022.

[2] S. Ambika, “A comparative study on marketing strategy of GPay and Paytm,” *YMER Digital*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 10493–10500, 2025.

[3] S. Choudhury, “Consumer behavior toward digital wallets during the COVID-19 pandemic in urban India,” *Journal of Digital Commerce and Consumer Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 85–97, 2021.

[4] Deepa and Lalitha, “A systematic review of banking frauds: Causes and consequences,” *International Journal of Financial Risk Management*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 78–95, 2022.

[5] R. Gokul Sai Ram, "A comparative study on customer satisfaction towards e-wallet applications: Paytm & Google Pay," MBA dissertation, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, India, 2021.

[6] V. Goyal and S. Goyal, "Customer satisfaction and adoption of digital payment systems in India after demonetization," *International Journal of Financial Technology Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 45–56, 2016.

[7] R. Joshi and Kumar, "India's digital transformation and its economic impact," *Economic Growth & Innovation Review*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 100–120, 2020.

[8] Kapoor, "Comparative analysis of digital wallet usage among urban consumers in Mumbai, Delhi, and Bangalore," *Journal of Financial Innovation and Consumer Research*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 55–68, 2023.

[9] K. S. R., "A study on customer satisfaction with Google Pay among students in Bangalore," *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 3871–3882, 2025, doi: 10.55248/gengpi.6.0325.11160.

[10] R. Mehta, "Sentiment analysis of customer reviews for digital payment applications in India," *International Journal of Data Analytics and FinTech Research*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 88–101, 2022.

[11] R. Mishra, "Impact of customer service quality on user satisfaction in digital wallet platforms," *Indian Journal of Service Management*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 34–48, 2019.

[12] S. Panchal and M. Balachandran, "UPI's success in reducing cash dependency in India," *Journal of Financial Technology*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 80–95, 2018.

[13] M. Rani and N. Saxena, "Factors influencing switching behavior among digital payment application users in India," *International Journal of Consumer Studies and Marketing Research*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 72–86, 2023.

[14] K. Rao, "The impact of gamification on customer engagement and satisfaction in digital payment applications," *Journal of FinTech and Behavioral Economics*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 29–41, 2021.

[15] B. J. Sekhar, "A study of customer satisfaction of Google Pay UPI payment apps," B.B.A. project report, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, India, 2021.

[16] P. Sharma, "User satisfaction with mobile payment services in urban India: A comparative analysis of Paytm and Google Pay," *Journal of Digital Banking and Payments*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 61–75, 2018.

[17] Singh, "Brand reputation, user experience, and adoption of digital payment applications among urban professionals," *Indian Journal of Marketing and Technology Management*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 20–33, 2020.

[18] S. Verma and D. Patel, "Digital payment preferences among college students in urban India," *Journal of Youth Consumer Behaviour*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 40–52, 2020.