

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [\[Fixed Mistake's!\] \[NEW\] Crypters Review \[Updated 24/7\]](#)

Dr. Plague - June 28, 2016, 11:00 pm

Hi guy's! Dr. Plague here, I am kind of new to HF but I want to start out HQ! I will be doing crypter review's for almost every crypter on HF. Please stay tuned! Attention! - If your product is on here, please read message at bottom of thread! Thanks!?

Want your crypter reviewed? Please PM me, I will see what I can do!?

Crypter #1 - CyberSeal - A .NET Crypter with .NET 2.0 Dependence's. Wanna purchase? Go here!
- <https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=4515065>

Background Story!

I bought this crypter like 4 month's ago! It was FUD right when I downloaded it. The FUD lasts a long time and if it get's 1-2 detection's it's fixed imminently! Great support and come's from a great coder! It had the longest FUD time I have seen in a public crypter!

Pro's!

- +Great support
- +Long lasting FUD
- +Always FUD
- +Lot's of feature's

Con's!

- Gen detection's may be hard to get rid of
- They should remove assembly or put a FUD assembly in the update
- Maybe should include FUD icon's too!
- .NET 2.0 Dependent

Usual FUD Time - 10-25 day's, sometimes longer!

Overall Opinion And Rating - This is a great crypter by a respected member! Do I think you should by this crypter? Yes! Overall I rate it 8/10!

Static crypter will be going here as Byte crypter has been removed due to a request from owner.?

Crypter #3 - Krazy crypter - A crypter with .NET 2.0 Dependencies. Wanna purchase? Go here! - [Thread!](#)

Background Story!

I purchased this crypter around 20 day's ago. I first opened it and I crypted and it had only 2 detection's. The next day it was 100% FUD! I really love the UI very clean and it's my favorite color! Blue! It also has a lot of feature's!

Pro's

- +Very nice UI
- +Re-fuded quickly
- +Very fast and nice support
- +Cheap price's for license's
- +Lost's and lot's of feature's

Con's

- FUD time is not the best out there
- Not for the "Noob" type. This can be good, or bad
- Like the con above some feature's people may not know how to work
- Which they would add a lifetime license but some people don't. All opinion's are different!
- .NET 2.0 Dependent

Usual FUD Time without ESETNOD Counting! - 1-5 day's

Usual FUD Time ESETNOD Counting! - 1-2 day's!

Overall Opinion And Rating - Overall this crypter is very good. The not that long FUD time is solved by fast update's. The large amount of feature's should make up for that though! Again, I really like the UI! Do I think you should buy this? Yes! Overall I Rate it 7/10!

Crypter #4 - Cloud Crypter - A online based crypter with .NET 2.0 Dependencies. Wanna purchase? Go here! - [Thread!](#)

Background Story!

I purchased Cloud Crypter about 1 week or less ago! Soon as I got my license from the owner I imminently tested it out! I put in multiple icons pack's. Then I setup all the setting's etc. I crypted and hit scan. 0/41 ! I really like when crypters are FUD soon as I get on them!

Pro's!

- +Always FUD
- +Great support
- +Lot's of feature's to choose from
- +Very nice UI

+Long FUD time

Con's!

- Online crypter, I would rather just have a program for easier crypting!
- Website has a little of a delay when switching option's. Very hard to notice.
- .NET 2.0 Dependent

Usual FUD Time without ESETNOD Counting! - 1-7 day's

Usual FUD Time ESETNOD Counting! - 1-3 day's!

Overall Opinion And Rating - This is a very misunderstood crypter! Some people say it is not very good, it is very good believe me! I still hope a program will be made for easier crypting. Do I think you should buy this crypter? Yes! Overall I Rate It 9/10!

Crypter #5 - Praesidium - A .NET crypter that is .NET 2.0 Dependent. Wanna buy? Go here! - [Thread!](#)

Background Story!

I actually purchased this soon as it came out. My friend said to do some tests on it. The first time I bought it was completely FUD! It stayed FUD for only 2 day's though then got 1 detection which isn't that bad! At least it was FUD when I bought it!

Pro's!

- +Usually FUD
- +97% USG for longer FUD
- +Great fast support
- +Great coder

Con's!

- Not that many feature's
- Does not support Native file's only .NET
- The FUD time is not the best in the world but is still good
- .NET 2.0 Dependent

Usual FUD Time without ESETNOD Counting! - 1-5 day's

Usual FUD Time ESETNOD Counting! - 1-3 day's!

Overall Opinion And Rating - This crypter is good I have to say. There is some room for growth as he recently launched it. I defiantly say there need's to be more feature's added in future to make this crypter 100%! Should you purchase this crypter? I say Yes and No, because of lack of feature's and it not support Native File's. If you like the feature's and you have a .NET file, then go ahead and buy it! Overall I Rate It 6/10!

Message To All Owner's/Coder's If Your Product Is On Here! ~ If you want me to review your crypter again if you did update's please contact me via PM. Anyway, I do not mean and "Hard feeling's" to any of you! You guy's all do great work, I am just doing this to suggest edit's etc! Please contact me before taking action etc. Thanks for everything again!?

Want to see runtime test's? Please tell me down below in the comment's! If we get enough people I will do them! Anyway, please go check out a awesome thread by meeting for runtime test's for now!
- [Thread!](#)

Want to ask question's about crypter's? Go here! - [Thread!](#)

Want to learn how to crypt Luminosity Link ? Go here! - [Thread!](#)

MrKebab - June 28, 2016, 11:21 pm

We already have a thread like this :)

Dr. Plague - June 28, 2016, 11:28 pm

(Jun 28, 2016 11:21 PM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) We already have a thread like this :)

Yes I know. I will be posting crypters not on that thread!?

MrKebab - June 28, 2016, 11:56 pm

(Jun 28, 2016 11:28 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yes I know. I will be posting crypters not on that thread!?

Oh ok, make sure to do proper runtime tests, without that.... Review will be kinda useless.

Bitdefender

Eset

Avg

Avira

Avast

Norton

Kaspersky

MSE

++

Dr. Plague - June 29, 2016, 4:41 am

(Jun 28, 2016 11:56 PM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Oh ok, make sure to do proper runtime tests, without that.... Review will be kinda useless.

Bitdefender

Eset

Avg

Avira

Avast

Norton

Kaspersky

MSE

++

Yeah, Soon as I add all the cryoters ill add that.:)

Twixles - June 29, 2016, 4:48 am

Awesome, to be honest the runtime tests is pretty useless information to me. I want to know how it's FUD, how quickly it gets a reFUD and so on. Could you add your average FUD time? (I know there's a ton of variables for us to consider here, but it'll give us a small idea of how the crypter is)

Dr. Plague - June 29, 2016, 4:55 am

(Jun 29, 2016 04:48 AM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Awesome, to be honest the runtime tests is pretty useless information to me. I want to know how it's FUD, how quickly it gets a reFUD and so on. Could you add your average FUD time? (I know there's a ton of variables for us to consider here, but it'll give us a small idea of how the crypter is)

Yes, I will add FUD time's! I will add how quickly it get's re-fuded too!?

MrKebab - June 29, 2016, 6:05 am

(Jun 29, 2016 04:48 AM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Awesome, to be honest the runtime tests is pretty useless information to me. I want to know how it's FUD, how quickly it gets a reFUD and so on. Could you add your average FUD time? (I know there's a ton of variables for us to consider here, but it'll give us a small idea of how the crypter is)

This is what i don't understand.

Runtime tests usless?

Quick refud, important?

I strongly disagree.

If a crypter isnt runtime fud, it will be uploaded immediately when ever it hits an antivirus that you dont bypass.

Several antiviruses also share their samples with virustotal. Guess what happens then?

Unfud! yaaaaay?....

It's a bad sign when a crypter needs a refud every day.. even if the author refuds it straight away but if detections pop up within a day or two, well then its shit. Doesnt matter of author refuds it quickly, its still shit.

It means that its overused and saturated. Lots of skids using it and author has to work his ass off to keep it fud.

I would never in my life buy a crypter that needs to be refudded every day. Ok the owner might be handling the detections great and refudding it.. But it doesnt mean its good at all.. rather the opposite.

Without being runtime fud, the crypter is useless.

Literally it would be the same as spreading a 35/35 detected file as scantime means nothing at all if it isnt runtime.

Mitlar - June 29, 2016, 7:44 am

Please add the following crypters to your thread

- CloudCrypter
- DataProtector
- Dragon Crypter

Twixles - June 29, 2016, 7:59 am

(Jun 29, 2016 06:05 AM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is what i don't understand.

Runtime tests usless?

Quick refud, important?

I strongly disagree.

If a crypter isnt runtime fud, it will be uploaded immediately when ever it hits an antivirus that you dont bypass.

Several antiviruses also share their samples with virustotal. Guess what happens then?

Unfud! yaaaaay?....

It's a bad sign when a crypter needs a refud every day.. even if the author refuds it straight away but if detections pop up within a day or two, well then its shit. Doesnt matter of author refuds it quickly, its still shit.

It means that its overused and saturated. Lots of skids using it and author has to work his ass off to keep it fud.

I would never in my life buy a crypter that needs to be refudded every day. Ok the owner might be handling the detections great and refudding it.. But it doesnt mean its good at all.. rather the opposite.

Without being runtime fud, the crypter is useless.

Literally it would be the same as spreading a 35/35 detected file as scantime means nothing at all if it isnt runtime.

You must be able to see how flawed those arguments are, that's just not how it works x.x

Hopsin - June 29, 2016, 11:04 am

Will you be doing review only from paid ones or the free (active) ones too ? Just wondering. Have a nice day btw.

RS7™ - June 29, 2016, 11:21 am

(Jun 29, 2016 11:04 AM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Will you be doing review only from paid ones or the free (active) ones too ? Just wondering. Have a nice day btw.

There is no point in doing the free ones since you can download them yourself and test it out.

Hopsin - June 29, 2016, 11:24 am

(Jun 29, 2016 11:21 AM)RS7™ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) There is no point in doing the free ones since you can download them yourself and test it out.

Not really. Sure you can try it yourself but this thread is about "Reviews" So, what about writing reviews for some free crypters based on OPs opinion ? It wouldn't harm either.

Dr. Plague - June 29, 2016, 1:32 pm

(Jun 29, 2016 07:44 AM)L????? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Please add the following crypters to your thread

- CloudCrypter
- DataProtector
- Dragon Crypter

Ill be adding cloud and a bunch more tonight! I do not have dragon and data currently though. I will be buying soon!?

MrKebab - June 29, 2016, 3:04 pm

(Jun 29, 2016 07:59 AM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You must be able to see how flawed those arguments are, that's just not how it works x.x

I hope you're trolling right?

Then explain to me how it "works" :)

Twixles - June 29, 2016, 3:36 pm

(Jun 29, 2016 03:04 PM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I hope you're trolling right?

Then explain to me how it "works" :)

Not being runtime FUD is having 1 detection or more. You think having 1 runtime detection is the same as 35/35 scantime detections. Do I seriously need to explain to you how wrong that is?

MrKebab - June 29, 2016, 4:22 pm

(Jun 29, 2016 03:36 PM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Not being runtime FUD is having 1 detection or more. You think having 1 runtime detection is the same as 35/35 scantime detections. Do I seriously need to explain to you how wrong that is?

Wow learn to read. You said it wasn't Important being runtime FUD. Not runtime FUD at all == 35/35.

When did you say not Important being runtime FUD against 1 antivirus? When did I say that?

We were talking of runtime FUD in general, not 1 frekkin antivirus.

Dr. Plague - June 29, 2016, 4:45 pm

Hey guy's! I just got back, I had a long day. Ill be updating the thread with new crypters in 2-3 hours! Thanks everyone for waiting!:))

Nick (Name) - June 29, 2016, 6:26 pm

Definitely check out Cryptic when it's released! If you're a great reviewer you'll have fun with this one once it's released ;)

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5078687>

Dr. Plague - June 29, 2016, 6:32 pm

(Jun 29, 2016 06:26 PM)Nick (Name) Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Definitely check out Cryptic when it's released! If you're a great reviewer you'll have fun with this one once it's released ;)

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5078687>

I am going to defiantly review this!

Guy's, I just added 2 more crypters. I will be adding more in 1-2 hours when I am not so busy, thanks!

(Jun 29, 2016 11:04 AM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Will you be doing review only from paid ones or the free (active) ones too ? Just wondering. Have a nice day btw.

Um, maybe I will review some of the one's that stick around longer like Visual. That will be in the way future as right now I am busy and only want to do paid as free change very often!?

Just updated it! I added Cloud Crpyter!:))

MrKebab - June 29, 2016, 8:49 pm

No runtime just words... Im outta here

Dr. Plague - June 29, 2016, 8:53 pm

(Jun 29, 2016 08:49 PM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) No runtime just words... Im outta here

Runtime will be in near future. Runtime take's awhile to test, right now I am providing what I am providing. If you don't like it then just leave like you said!?

Fluffy_ - June 29, 2016, 8:54 pm

(Jun 28, 2016 11:00 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Online crypter resulting in not as strong encryption. I would love to see a program too

The fuck? That doesn't make sense.

Dr. Plague - June 29, 2016, 8:55 pm

(Jun 29, 2016 08:54 PM)Fluffy_ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The fuck? That doesn't make sense.

Yes it does. Let me find you a thread one second. Overall it is a very very good crypter though!? If I am wrong someone please correct me so I can fix it. I still believe that online crypters still have not as strong encryption. Thanks!

Just added Praesidium crypter guy's! Come check it out!

Also guy's, I wanted to ask if you guy's wanted to see like a scan like every Monday for all crypters? Please tell me if you do, It's a lot of work but I will do it!:)

MrKebab - June 29, 2016, 9:29 pm

Strong encryption does not matter. You can use aes(advanced) or xor(simple) or your own custom encryption. Does not matter at all,as long as it requires a key.

Twixles - June 30, 2016, 1:08 am

I suggest you add spoilers for each crypter, makes it look more organized :)

Codefuser - June 30, 2016, 7:14 am

LOL you never tested GhostCrypter, which you are the support for. Scared that the low FUD time shows?

Hopsin - June 30, 2016, 7:23 am

(Jun 30, 2016 01:08 AM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I suggest you add spoilers for each crypter, makes it look more organized :)

Good Idea, so owners of each crypter will see this thread and mark it as sales trashing if they see something bad about their crypter.

Very nice thinking.... ?

Codefuser - June 30, 2016, 7:23 am

Quote:-Online crypter resulting in not as strong encryption.

Quote:I still hope a program will be made resulting in longer FUD and stronger encryption

This proves that you know nothing about crypters tbh. Anything that uses a key and shuffle bytes will remove the detection immediately (assuming the other parts of your code are not detected). Simply using Xor with a 1 byte key will remove detections.

Hopsin - June 30, 2016, 7:26 am

(Jun 29, 2016 08:54 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Online crypter resulting in not as strong encryption. I would love to see a program too

I am not sure how to react on this. Do you know anything about crypters ?

Codefuser - June 30, 2016, 7:33 am

(Jun 30, 2016 07:26 AM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I am not sure how to react on this. Do you know anything about crypters ?

xD repeating my point, eh?

Anyway I think I will trust Meeting's review more than this guy. Agreed?

Hopsin - June 30, 2016, 7:35 am

(Jun 30, 2016 07:33 AM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) xD repeating my point, eh?

Anyway I think I will trust Meeting's review more than this guy. Agreed?

Well, I was typing that reply-message which I delayed and you were 3 minutes faster than me haha ?

Codefuser - June 30, 2016, 7:39 am

(Jun 30, 2016 07:35 AM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well, I was typing that reply-message which I delayed and you were 3 minutes faster than me haha ?

That's why we should replace forums technology with IM, but so that people can see what others are typing as well.

aesad - June 30, 2016, 8:29 am

Test BetaCrypt next time xd. If you have money.

Hopsin - June 30, 2016, 8:34 am

(Jun 30, 2016 07:39 AM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That's why we should replace forums technology with IM, but so that people can see what others are typing as well.

Maybe. This system would be better with PMs, much more efficient. ?

Twixles - June 30, 2016, 8:46 am

(Jun 30, 2016 07:23 AM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Good Idea, so owners of each crypter will see this thread and mark it as sales trashing if they see something bad about their crypter.

Very nice thinking.... ?

Ehm... What? ?

DeluxeSoftware - June 30, 2016, 11:41 am

(Jun 30, 2016 07:14 AM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) LOL you never tested GhostCrypter, which you are the support for. Scared that the low FUD time shows?Just saw this. People would say review is fake and yeah. It's just about fairness.

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 12:39 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 11:41 AM)DeluxeSoftware Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Just saw this. People would say review is fake and yeah. It's just about fairness.

Yep, so I decided not too!? Anyway, I fixed the cloud crypter saying it is not as strong. Sorry everyone, my mistake!? Ill be adding static crypter tonight!?

MrStab - June 30, 2016, 12:48 pm

Nice reviews. Thanks for the contribution. My only critique, would be that it would look better if you took the time to use a little text formatting (such as bold, and colored text). It would make it look better, and be easier to read. ?

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 12:49 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 12:48 PM)MrStab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Nice reviews. Thanks for the contribution. My only critique, would be that it would look better if you took the time to use a little text formatting (such as bold, and colored text). It would make it look better, and be easier to read. ?

Yeah, I am planning to add spoiler's etc. I have been really busy and have had barley anytime to add the crypters! Tonight I will be free and fix it up and add stuff!? Thanks for liking it!?

Which crypter would you guy's like to see to be added first?

1. Tropher Crypter

2. Static Crypter

I will add both at some time, just decide which one first!

Please PM or post on thread which crypters you want added, I will do my best!

@Everybody, please forgive me for my mistake with Cloud Crypter. I made a honest mistake!:))

@Everybody, I will not review Ghost Crypter as it may be seen as "not fair" :.)

@Coders and everybody, Please do not see this as sale's trashing. I just provide honest opinion's. Like I said in the thread, Pm me before taking action. I will gladly do my best to help or re-review!:))

Codefuser - June 30, 2016, 1:04 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 11:41 AM)DeluxeSoftware Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Just saw this. People would say review is fake and yeah. It's just about fairness.

Good point

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 1:07 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 01:04 PM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Good point

Yes! All I want is to be fair 100%!?

Again, if you guy's suggest any spelling error's mistake's etc. Please just tell me, I will fix them right away!

Kamizuki - June 30, 2016, 1:31 pm

Vouch for Dr. Plague. He is legit as can be.

Hopsin - June 30, 2016, 1:33 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 01:07 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yes! All I want is to be fair 100%!?

Again, if you guy's suggest any spelling error's mistake's etc. Please just tell me, I will fix them right away!

Why you just don't use spell checker ? ? Have a nice day

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 1:34 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 01:33 PM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Why you just don't use spell checker ? ? Have a nice day

Thanks for suggestion. I did use it!? If their are any error's you guy's notice please still tell me, thanks!?

Hopsin - June 30, 2016, 1:38 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 01:34 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Thanks for suggestion. I did use it!? If their are any error's you guy's notice please still tell me, thanks!?

No problem buddy. You mean grammar errors right? You should better correct that haha ? ?

Have a nice day

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 1:39 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 01:38 PM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) No problem buddy. You mean grammar errors right? You should better correct that haha ? ?

Have a nice day

Lol, I just got off work and I am very tired. I will fix my mistake's that I posted when I wake back up lol.??

Hopsin - June 30, 2016, 1:47 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 01:39 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Lol, I just got off work and I am very tired. I will fix my mistake's that I posted when I wake back up lol.??

Haha its okay buddy. Quite understandable to be honest.. ?

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 5:37 pm

Ill be adding static in about 1 hour, so stay tuned in!:)

Just updated the thread design a little bit.:) You guy's like?

Sheeple - June 30, 2016, 6:17 pm

How come every plural word alway's i's typed something along the line's like thi's

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 6:22 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 06:17 PM)Sheeple Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) How come every plural word alway's i's typed something along the line's like thi's

Sorry lol. I will fix in a bit.?

Sheeple - June 30, 2016, 6:28 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 06:22 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Sorry lol. I will fix in a bit.?

It's all good.

But thanks for the reviews. Will be needing to use this when I need a new crypter :)

Codefuser - June 30, 2016, 6:54 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 01:07 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yes! All I want is to be fair 100%!?

Again, if you guy's suggest any spelling error's mistake's etc. Please just tell me, I will fix them right away!

when you are using plural nouns, no need to put the ' before the s

Dr. Plague - June 30, 2016, 8:01 pm

(Jun 30, 2016 06:28 PM)Sheeple Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's all good.

But thanks for the reviews. Will be needing to use this when I need a new crypter :)

Thanks for the thanks lol. I wasn't able to add ststic tonight sorry guy's! Ill be adding it tomorrow!?

ColbzgotdaHax - June 30, 2016, 9:07 pm

Will this work with darktrack alien

DeluxeSoftware - June 30, 2016, 11:59 pm

I have to admit that I don't like your reviews/can't agree with them.

You say CyberSeal would be 10-25 days FUD and rate it 8/10 and ByteCrypter max. 10 days or so and you rate it 10/10.

I know that CyberSeal does not lasts 10-25 days FUD. It lasts like max. 3 days FUD and then gets detected by ESET. (No offense, I know ESET detects fast)

So well, I can't agree with your results. You should add scanwatches to proof your statements to the crypters.

//EDIT:

You said you bought CloudCrypter 1 week or less ago and claim it would be fud to 10 days. Again, nonsense.

Cyber Coder - July 1, 2016, 12:07 am

(Jun 30, 2016 11:59 PM)DeluxeSoftware Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I have to admit that I don't like your reviews/can't agree with them.

You say CyberSeal would be 10-25 days FUD and rate it 8/10 and ByteCrypter max. 10 days or so and you rate it 10/10.

I know that CyberSeal does not last 10-25 days FUD. It lasts like max. 3 days FUD and then gets detected by ESET. (No offense, I know ESET detects fast)

So well, I can't agree with your results. You should add scanwatches to proof your statements to the crypters.

yeah but it rarely goes above 1/35 in a month so just because 1 av gets it fast doesn't mean others do as well so it still has long fud times. If we compare fud times based on eset no popular crypter will get past 1-3 days fud times

DeluxeSoftware - July 1, 2016, 12:29 am

(Jul 1, 2016 12:07 AM)Cyber Coder Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) yeah but it rarely goes above 1/35 in a month so just because 1 av gets it fast doesn't mean others do as well so it still has long fud times. If we compare fud times based on eset no popular crypter will get past 1-3 days fud times but FUD is still = 0/35 and not 1/35 even if it is just ESET.

and yeah, popular crypter will get past ESET 1-3 days and longer. I can say that because of GhostCrypter results ?

Cyber Coder - July 1, 2016, 12:59 am

(Jul 1, 2016 12:29 AM)DeluxeSoftware Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) but FUD is still = 0/35 and not 1/35 even if it is just ESET.

and yeah, popular crypter will get past ESET 1-3 days and longer. I can say that because of GhostCrypter results ?

yeah but having 1 detection in 2 days and 5 other detections in 2 weeks is not the same thing with having 1 detection in 2 days and no other detection for about 1 month

DeluxeSoftware - July 1, 2016, 1:19 am

(Jul 1, 2016 12:59 AM)Cyber Coder Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) yeah but having 1 detection in 2 days and 5 other detections in 2 weeks is not the same thing with having 1 detection in 2 days and no other detection for about 1 month

Yeah.

Anyways OP states your crypter would be 10-25 days FUD. Which is not true and you said that too.

So he is giving kinda wrong reviews and judges them wrong.

MrKebab - July 1, 2016, 1:50 am

This whole thread is bs, OP doesn't have the required experience to review proper. Just empty words. Go with meetings thread Instead.

Dr. Plague - July 1, 2016, 4:54 am

(Jul 1, 2016 01:50 AM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This whole thread is bs, OP doesn't have the required experience to review proper. Just empty words. Go with meetings thread Instead.

I don't have the experience now do I? Don't look at my account age... Even though I wasn't on HF doesn't mean I can't buy them!?

@Everybody, I am sorry for the FUD time problem. I wasn't counting ESETNOD sorry!? Soon as I get home, I will fix all the FUD Time's and all the review's. Sorry again!?

MrKebab - July 1, 2016, 6:11 am

(Jul 1, 2016 04:54 AM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't have the experience now do I? Don't look at my account age... Even though I wasn't on HF doesn't mean I can't buy them!?

@Everybody, I am sorry for the FUD time problem. I wasn't counting ESETNOD sorry!? Soon as I get home, I will fix all the FUD Time's and all the review's. Sorry again!?

I'm not looking at your account age. How long you've been on hf doesn't matter to me at all. But i've read through many of your statements and you clearly do not understand how a crypter works in depth. Several of your statements are totally wrong. The way youre testing is wrong, everything about this thread is just wrong. Props for trying but this is not good enough. I dont mean to act like a dick but thats the truth.

Demoralise - July 1, 2016, 6:17 am

(Jul 1, 2016 06:11 AM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'm not looking at your account age. How long you've been on hf doesn't matter to me at all. But i've read through many of your statements and you clearly do not understand how a crypter works in depth. Several of your statements are totally wrong. The way youre testing is wrong, everything about this thread is just wrong. Props for trying but this is not good enough. I dont mean to act like a dick but thats the truth. Don't be an asshole, the guy is trying and this is the only thread of this type. He deserves a props for the time spent and the money spent providing this service for the community.

To be honest, it is almost impossible to use a crypter wrong and pumping a file by 10 MB IS a good option for many of the antiviruses, however thirty second delay tends to do the trick instead of needing to pump the file in most cases.

MrKebab - July 1, 2016, 6:32 am

(Jul 1, 2016 06:17 AM)Demoralise Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Don't be an asshole, the guy is trying and this is the only thread of this type. He deserves a props for the time spent and the money spent providing this service for the community.

To be honest, it is almost impossible to use a crypter wrong and pumping a file by 10 MB IS a good option for many of the antiviruses, however thirty second delay tends to do the trick instead of needing to pump the file in most cases. Thats what i said, props for trying.

10mb works on norton.

35sec delay works on avast.

None other. Just those two.

But i was not talking about those statements.

Its not the only thread of this type. There are several, where Meetings contains the most vital information.

Dr. Plague - July 1, 2016, 9:37 am

(Jul 1, 2016 06:17 AM)Demoralise Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Don't be an asshole, the guy is trying and this is the only thread of this type. He deserves a props for the time spent and the money spent providing this service for the community.

To be honest, it is almost impossible to use a crypter wrong and pumping a file by 10 MB IS a good option for many of the antiviruses, however thirty second delay tends to do the trick instead of needing to pump the file in most cases.

Thanks for supporting me!? I messed up on a couple thing's and I realized that! That's why I took down the hole thing and I am fixing it!? Everybody messes up, were all human's. Some people don't fix their mistakes I do!?

Hey guy's, just updated the thread! Tell me if their are any more mistake's that I need to fix!:) I hope this time I don't get as much hate lol.:)

Nysta - July 1, 2016, 10:53 am

Great review! I am glad to see you updated to fix the mistakes :)

Varane - July 1, 2016, 10:55 am

Huge vouch for these reviews, they are 100% honest.

Dr. Plague - July 1, 2016, 10:59 am

Anybody want any crypter reviewed? Quote this message and list them or it!:) I will be adding Static for sure tonight. Sorry for delay.

Hey guy's! I have 1 question, would you guy's like to see a crypter help desk? If so please tell me! I will see if I can make this possible!:))

Kamizuki - July 1, 2016, 11:42 am

Solid update on this right here!

Codefuser - July 1, 2016, 1:04 pm

Quote:Praesidium - A Non-Dependent crypter

It is .NET? And it only support .NET files?

Dr. Plague - July 1, 2016, 1:09 pm

(Jul 1, 2016 01:04 PM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It is .NET? And it only support .NET files?

Sorry, when I added it I messed up. It is .NET 2.0 Dependent and does not support Native file's. I was going to fix where I saw non-dependent but I forgot. Anyway, thanks for telling me so I remembered!??

MrKebab - July 1, 2016, 3:22 pm

Why dont you test the actual FUD time for real instead of just writing what you think or read what other people says. Crypt a stub. Test it every day.

Still waiting for those runtime tests.

Twixles - July 1, 2016, 3:23 pm

Just curious here, how do you test the FUD time? Do you crypt and do nothing but wait, or do you spread it? Also how many tests do you do for each crypter?

MrKebab - July 1, 2016, 3:24 pm

I can crypt a file with cyberseal and guarantee you it wont last 10 days if i spread it :) probably wont if im not spreading it either

xLelouch - July 1, 2016, 6:39 pm

Kindly add this link to end of the thread for people to check runtime scans.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5199646>

Dr. Plague - July 1, 2016, 8:53 pm

(Jul 1, 2016 03:22 PM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Why dont you test the actual FUD time for real instead of just writing what you think or read what other people says. Crypt a stub. Test it every day.

Still waiting for those runtime tests.

I do test it. I scanned them everyday and waited for a detection then marked it down in my notepad to remember!?

(Jul 1, 2016 03:23 PM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Just curious here, how do you test the FUD time? Do you crypt and do nothing but wait, or do you spread it? Also how many tests do you do for each crypter?

I do not have to spread unless it was a private stub. All the one's that are currently on this thread are all public shared stub's!?

(Jul 1, 2016 03:24 PM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I can crypt a file with cyberseal and guarantee you it wont last 10 days if i spread it :) probably wont if im not spreading it either
If you have 1 shared stub other people are probably spreading already. ?

(Jul 1, 2016 03:24 PM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I can crypt a file with cyberseal and guarantee you it wont last 10 days if i spread it :) probably wont if im not spreading it either
If you have 1 shared stub other people are probably spreading already. ?

(Jul 1, 2016 06:39 PM)xLelouch Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Kindly add this link to end of the thread for people to check runtime scans.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5199646>

Yeah, I was going to do that but forgot lol. I will maybe add runtime tests in the future.?

Hey guy's! I just updated all the crypters and instead of linking the link I put - Thread! with a link built in! You guy's like it better?:)

VisualSoft - July 1, 2016, 9:46 pm

you got a mistake in Byte Crypter

Its .NET 2.0 Dependent like all other crypters.

Dr. Plague - July 1, 2016, 10:01 pm

(Jul 1, 2016 09:46 PM)VisualSoft Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) you got a mistake in Byte Crypter

Its .NET 2.0 Dependent like all other crypters.

Thank you for reminding me lol. The same thing happen with the other crypter. I made a mistake and was gonna fix it but forgot lol. Thanks for reminding me!?

Fixed, sorry for mistake guy's! I forgot to fix that!:) Anyway, please tell me if their are mistake's. I will fix them right away!:)

All mistakes should be fixed by now. If you guy's find one please tell me. I also forgot to add static crypter last night. If I do not do it tonight I promise it will be done by tomorrow! Sorry for delay, I am very busy and these review's take awhile to make.:)

Otis???????????????? - July 1, 2016, 11:56 pm

These are extremely HQ, Dr Plague!

frankokoye - July 2, 2016, 3:54 am

(Jul 1, 2016 10:59 AM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hey guy's! I have 1 question, would you guy's like to see a crypter help desk? If so please tell me! I will see if I can make this possible!:)

Help desk how? explain better, is it different from the actual support from each crypter coder?

AutoComplex - July 2, 2016, 5:11 am

whats ur skype man ? i got few questions.

Dr. Plague - July 2, 2016, 6:29 am

(Jul 2, 2016 03:54 AM)frankokoye Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Help desk how? explain better, is it different from the actual support from each crypter coder?

I would help solve issues etc.?

(Jul 2, 2016 05:11 AM)AutoComplex Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) whats ur skype man ? i got few questions. Can you just PM me??

EDIT: Just saw you have 15 post's. Ill PM you the Skype!:))

Codefuser - July 2, 2016, 8:40 am

(Jul 2, 2016 06:29 AM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I would help solve issues etc.?

> help solve issues

> thinks strong encryption = fud

Emilz - July 2, 2016, 8:49 am

(Jun 29, 2016 04:48 AM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Awesome, to be honest the runtime tests is pretty useless information to me. I want to know how it's FUD, how quickly it gets a reFUD and so on. Could you add your average FUD time? (I know there's a ton of variables for us to consider here, but it'll give us a small idea of how the crypter is)

Your are useless information to the whole of HF.

Runtime is the most important thing you noob, 100% scantimefud, and no runtime bypasses and the file is useless, just like you! :D

Also this thread is useless without proper runtime tests.

MrKebab - July 2, 2016, 8:51 am

(Jul 1, 2016 08:53 PM)Dr. Plague Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I do test it. I scanned them everyday and waited for a detection then marked it down in my notepad to remember!?

I do not have to spread unless it was a private stub. All the one's that are currently on this thread are all public shared stub's!?

If you have 1 shared stub other people are probably spreading already. ?

If you have 1 shared stub other people are probably spreading already. ?

Yeah, I was going to do that but forgot lol. I will maybe add runtime tests in the future.?

Hey guy's! I just updated all the crypters and instead of linking the link I put - Thread! with a link built in! You guy's like it better?:)

You test runtime results? 25 days FUD and account on Hf is 6 days old? GG

Twixles - July 2, 2016, 9:02 am

(Jul 2, 2016 08:49 AM)Emilz Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Your are useless information to the whole of HF.

Runtime is the most important thing you noob, 100% scantimefud, and no runtime bypasses and the file is useless, just like you! :D

Also this thread is useless without proper runtime tests.

I already know somewhat what the runtime results are for the crypters here on HF. Therefore it is useless information for "me" -.-

Codefuser - July 2, 2016, 9:08 am

(Jul 2, 2016 08:51 AM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You test runtime results? 25 days FUD and account on Hf is 6 days old? GG
GG OP just got rekt

Also add scan result please. Who knows if you are just bullshitting or not?

Dr. Plague - July 2, 2016, 5:31 pm

(Jul 2, 2016 08:51 AM)MrKebab Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You test runtime results? 25 days FUD and account on Hf is 6 days old? GG
WOW! So apparently now I can't buy them through Skype contact? GG OP!?

(Jul 2, 2016 09:08 AM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) GG OP just got rekt

Also add scan result please. Who knows if you are just bullshitting or not?
I am going to add scan results and update them every Monday. You do understand that I am busy right? Anyway, why do people hate on a free review? Just wow guy's.?

(Jul 2, 2016 09:02 AM)Twixles Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I already know somewhat what the runtime results are for the crypters here on HF. Therefore it is useless information for "me" -.-
Thanks I will be adding runtime soon as they take a lot of time. I also thank you for supporting me as other people hate on someone who took a lot of time to do this. Thanks you!??

(Jul 2, 2016 08:40 AM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) > help solve issues
> thinks strong encryption = fud
Actually no I do not think strong encryption = FUD. I already said I messed up and forgot to fix. If you guy's don't like this thread please stop hating on it and just leave!?

Also guy's, I have to remove Byte Crypter as Royal requested me too! Sorry everyone!:))

Hey guy's, just added my crypter help desk at the bottom of the thread. If you wanna ask question's go there!:))

NUTISTIC STUDIOS - July 3, 2016, 2:49 am

May i ask the reason behind why ByteCrypter review has been deleted from this thread?

Codefuser - July 3, 2016, 7:54 am

(Jul 3, 2016 02:49 AM)NUTISTIC STUDIOS Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) May i ask the reason behind why ByteCrypter review has been deleted from this thread?
Owner requested it to be.

NUTISTIC STUDIOS - July 3, 2016, 8:12 am

(Jul 3, 2016 07:54 AM)Codefuser Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Owner requested it to be.
Yea, but why though? It was given a 9/10.

Dr. Plague - July 3, 2016, 8:27 am

(Jul 3, 2016 02:49 AM)NUTISTIC STUDIOS Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) May i ask the reason behind why ByteCrypter review has been deleted from this thread?
The owner Royal requested to have his crypter be deleted from this thread. I do not know why though because it is a very good crypter 9/10.?

Sorry guy's I just noticed I accidentally deleted CyberSeal! My bad, adding it again soon!:)

Otis???????????????? - July 3, 2016, 11:00 am

Do not hesitate to deal with OP. I've known OP for a while and I must say, he is always high quality and trustable. I highly recommend! ?

Dr. Plague - July 3, 2016, 11:00 am

CyberSeal has just been added again!:))

Static crypter is 95% done! Sorry for delay!

I feel so bad guy's... I haven't been able to add anything. I am truly sorry as I have been with friends and family because of 4th of July! I promise atleast 2 crypters will be added by the end of this week!:))