

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Anyone interested in a 'Private Stresser'](#)

ProtectNull™ - April 7, 2016, 5:44 pm

I know that the stresser market is growing + a lot of stressers are coming out each week,

But lets face it, the power that you get will decrease in a certain amount of times as power gets divided by how many users are using it.

My idea is to have only a little people with a decent amount of power, with longer attacks.

What do you think?

Brotherhood. - April 7, 2016, 5:47 pm

Sounds great, but would it be expensive?

Ninetales. - April 7, 2016, 5:49 pm

At that point u might as well buy your own bots !!

ProtectNull™ - April 7, 2016, 5:49 pm

(Apr 7, 2016 05:47 PM)toneuk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Sounds great, but would it be expensive?

Affordable, enough for me to maintain it and pay for the servers + profit a bit. Not too much that you'll choke.

(Apr 7, 2016 05:49 PM)Ninetales. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) At that point u might as well buy your own bots !!
I was thinking about that when I'm fully established and just link the botnet API to the main power.

?Synapse - April 7, 2016, 5:49 pm

It sounds like a good idea, I'm assuming the price will be high if it has good booting power and low users.

struct_t - April 7, 2016, 5:55 pm

"a certain amount of times as power gets divided by how many users are using it."

Then don't limit userbase, change functionality. Slot attacks through peak attack times. Like, use a backlog and limit the amount of synchronous attacks.

void account - April 7, 2016, 6:01 pm

Why not take it the extra step and simply set up servers for people? I remember a long time ago on a different forum I sold "Help-You" packages which I guided newbies with some \$ to spend into making their own servers. I gave them a few scripts too... Won't be doing that here though, I'm definitely not caught up with today's stresser competition and don't plan on getting back in on it.

Just a thought, OP.

ProtectNull™ - April 7, 2016, 6:32 pm

(Apr 7, 2016 06:01 PM)AIM Solutions Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Why not take it the extra step and simply set up servers for people? I remember a long time ago on a different forum I sold "Help-You" packages which I guided newbies with some \$ to spend into making their own servers. I gave them a few scripts too... Won't be doing that here though, I'm definitely not caught up with today's stresser

competition and don't plan on getting back in on it.

Just a thought, OP.

I could do that, but I think long term wise the stresser is better

What prices do you think I should do it on a month?

void account - April 7, 2016, 7:20 pm

(Apr 7, 2016 06:32 PM)ProtectNull™ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I could do that, but I think long term wise the stresser is better

What prices do you think I should do it on a month?

You should use a simple algorithm that calculates how many users the big boys in the Stresser market have, then correlate that with the power and price, and simply plug and play with numbers to have a sustainable model. Make sure you factor in static costs such as server upkeep, whatever you value your time to be, website protection, legal documentation if you plan to make this bigger, and so on. I'm not sure how far you want to go so I'll just stop here.

Tokyo - April 7, 2016, 7:42 pm

The price range is key to your profit in this.

xLelouch - April 8, 2016, 3:18 am

Well. its about the power the stresser has. Some stressers lets you maintain 30-40 Gbps which is great.

Eilif - April 8, 2016, 8:25 am

(Apr 7, 2016 05:55 PM)struct_t Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Like, use a backlog and limit the amount of synchronous attacks.

This.. some customers dont need instant response. Just queue a strong attack 4h beforehand for 3600 secs rather than a weak one instantly. Im amazed nobody has a queue based source in use.

struct_t - April 8, 2016, 11:57 am

(Apr 8, 2016 08:25 AM)stefeman Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This.. some customers dont need instant response. Just queue a strong attack 4h beforehand for 3600 secs rather than a weak one instantly. Im amazed nobody has a queue based source in use.

Yeah, I disagree about the 4 hour before hand thing. I think a backlog queue system with a limit of how many attacks threads can be running is important.