

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Wolf's eBook & Method review for Wrecked's 24/7 BTC Autopilot Method](#)

• **Enlil Wolf** • - May 3, 2019, 12:43 pm

[Method Thread => Wrecked's 24/7 Automatic BTC Money Making Method \[\\$5-\\$20 an HOUR\]
\[100% AUTOPILOT\]](#)

Wolf's Vouch Review - Member of Appraisers (Invitation accepted):

=====

(We as members of the Appraisers Team believe in being the first line of defense against LQ products/methods/services and we do our best in going through them to ensure that the HF marketplace has sellers, methods & services which are actually HQ and that the methods/services and the products being sold actually deliver)

Which is why we urge people to wait for vouch reviews before they buy into any method(s) or service(s).

Before I begin my review for this method, I would like to thank you for giving us ("Appraisers"), the opportunity to review your method(s) to ensure it is HQ.

On to the Method/Service:

=====

As said above, people should wait for vouch reviews before they jump into any method(s) or service(s) provided.

Wre©ked has been exceptionally professional and provided top-notch support with the numerous questions I had on what made his so-called 'method' unique compared to all other gambling scripts available on the forum. Gambling is after all gambling and we are bound to lose money in the end anyway if we aren't careful. I'm glad that OP was very prompt in his responses and explained in details all my queries. Most importantly out of all the queries I had - he made it clear that this was not a script he was selling for bustadice or other similar betting sites. This was based on the probability that he had come up with after hours & hours of testing on his front.

As OP had granted me a vouch copy yet again, I had been working hard & diligently checking in on this for the past few hours on the method provided by Wre©ked.

(Because self-proclaimed words can only carry you so far - we needed to know if this is something that actually works)

My initial thoughts after glancing at the method - Looks Promising but let's test it in action.

Originality: Quite Original in terms of Betting & Gambling (7/10)

Let's start with one of the most important things to any methods/services being provided. How original is the method? Why is it important?

Spoiler ([Click to View](#))

I have had experience with most of the sub-par 'Martingale' betting scripts being sold on HF as I had bought into those in the past and let's just say - it has never ended well neither for me or for any of the buyers in general. Of course, all sellers will defend themselves in the end by saying it is gambling. Which is true but then again why are you promoting something promising false beliefs that it will make you money - when we are going to lose money in the end anyway. Right? doesn't make any sense. Their most common defense is saying - we are giving you the winning edge to make some quick profit but it never truly works out in longer time periods unless you end up using a high bankroll which contradicts the usual notion - 'Don't bet more than you're willing to lose'

Most people on HF are looking to make consistent long-term earnings via methods or services provided but let me clarify that 'Gambling' is not the way to do that. You can't predict or fool the 'system' - they always end up winning in the end, no matter what the sellers end up saying. I haven't met anyone who got rich just by betting & gambling using a script from here or any other forum as a matter of fact. So, keep that in mind when you are investing in this. But with moderate use and not getting greedy, I can see this particular method working quite well compared to other gambling scripts which are being sold on here. From my experience, 99% of them are practically useless and in my view 'worthless'

But in terms of originality for this method - it's a breath of fresh air that sellers like the OP are trying to bring in something new to the marketplace in terms of 'Gambling & Betting'. The best we can rate this method's originality is around 7. Because after going through multiple known strategies around forums & youtube videos, I was pleased to find in my research that the 'probability method' he is selling is something completely new & unique and not some recycled 'shit'. And just for that, this method deserves the '7' for being original and also because OP is not selling us a recycled 'Martingale based script'.

Content: A few things can be added (or) improved to bolster the Quality (6.5/10)

Next most important thing - Is the content satisfactory?

Spoiler ([Click to View](#))

Well, firstly when you buy into this method - OP will be providing you a (.PDF) which details his method, the steps with a few accompanying pictures, the probability method and of course a few additional tips which helps in making the earnings more efficient.

Since this particular method is something which boasts itself of being able to generate a 'certain sum' per hour based on your 'capital investment' - I had to make sure that what he claims is actually backed up by hard evidence. Based on my research and testing done for this method, I have had it running for 20+ hours now at this point and with a capital of \$50 which is the recommended amount specified by him, I have generated about \$234 in profits besides my \$50 capital. OP claims, it's possible to do \$5-10/hour - in the end, it depends on the PC that you're using. With lower end PC's & Laptops generating about \$5-6 and higher end Laptops & PC's pulling in \$7-10. By this calculation, your principal is released within 5-10 hours from starting.

At which point, I suggest you pull out your initial investment and keep it running with the House money. I'll further keep this running for a full 24 hours and more to see how long it can keep running without going bust. OP specified, while he was formulating this method - that he had it running for almost a week with 3 million in rotational bets, I have only crossed the 50 Thousand mark at the time of writing this review, so let's see if it can go the distance.

But from my initial 24 hour impression, I am glad to see that I haven't lost money for the first time while trying something which is associated with 'Gambling & Betting'.

Now coming back to the content provided by the OP, there is something I'd have liked to see in the (.PDF) - for instance, having an excel sheet which pre-determines the 'capital' needed based on the 'base bet' you're starting with. It's quite easy and I am sure he can create an Excel sheet for that because having a predetermined value in your (.PDF) is not enough for all people. Some rich people would probably want to try it with \$500-1000 and for them having something where they can try and check it for themselves without disturbing the OP would be beneficial. At one point, it can become troublesome for him and for the buyers as well. So, it's best to give the tools to your customers and only be bothered with other important queries rather than trivial ones like - "Hey, how much can I get with this?" or "How much should I invest, can you check it for me?"

Other than that, it would have been great to explain in your (.PDF) on how the probability method works.

Something like a segment titled, "About the probability method and why it works -" something like that would be a good addition.

Difficulty: Not difficult to Set-up at all (10/10)

How difficult is the thing? Amateur or Pro level?

Spoiler ([Click to View](#))

From my experience, the (.PDF) provided is more than enough to guide you with all the steps. OP had made sure, he posted accompanying pictures so that his steps are not confusing and people don't end up blaming him for someone setting it up wrong. Other than that, from my own personal experience & testing - it basically took me 3-4 minutes to set it all up. So far, I haven't had to touch it - so it is indeed fully autopilot.

[i]I believe you can also rent a VPS and have it run there especially if you don't have a laptop or desktop that you would want to keep it running for 24/7.

I haven't personally tried that but it seems doable from what he explained. The only thing we need to make sure is that we rent a powerful enough VPS to let it run in its optimum capacity. Other than that, I'd say setting everything is easy and anyone can do it.[/i]

Price: Reasonable Enough (7/10)

Pricing structure - Is it okay?

Spoiler ([Click to View](#))

On the thread, OP is stating that he is currently going to sell only 10 copies of the method. Not sure,

if he intends to sell more down the line - I believe he won't but based on his current breakdown. I would say the price is justifiable for two reasons - since it is not a 'Martingale based script' and secondly because you can pull out your capital in 5-10 hours at most. Based on that, I'd say even with the last few copies being \$75 - it'd still be at a fair price point.

Overall: Gambling is Gambling, Use Moderately
(A Wolf in a Sheep's clothing doesn't make it a Sheep) (7.6/10)

My Verdict - Be Responsible as it is still considered 'Gambling'

Spoiler ([Click to View](#))

As highlighted above, I am extremely pleased with what I have seen. This may not be a 'Gambling Script' but don't forget that this is still a 'Gambling method'. Be responsible and use with caution. In terms of everything, I have seen on the forums - I applaud the OP for bringing in something unique. I'd, of course, love to see some minor additions & changes to make the final price tag of \$75 for the last few copies to be even more viable than it already is.

But as I said above, Gambling is Gambling' - Be moderate, Control your greed & urges and pull out in advance.

(Don't blame the seller for your mistakes and take responsibility for your own actions especially when you're the one gambling)

(Have a Lovely & Great Day everyone)
Regards, Wolf ?

Wre@ked - May 3, 2019, 2:15 pm

You are the best. Absolute joy working with you and thank you very very much for this HQ review. What you do is greatly appreciated!

Jombah - May 3, 2019, 3:05 pm

Glad to see you're on the Appraisers, definitely the best reviewer currently.

Wre@ked - May 3, 2019, 3:39 pm

(May 3, 2019 03:05 PM)Jombah Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Glad to see you're on the Appraisers, definitely the best reviewer currently.

Without a doubt, his reviews are always top of the line!

Deal - May 3, 2019, 9:25 pm

What the fuck is this review?

This is so biased I can't even.. It is so obvious that this review is meant to show the shitty method sellers that they should not be worried about the reviews because you guys have a hard time finding some to review. Don't tell me that a fucking gambling script can get top ratings in everything.

This is the most shittiest and biased shit I have ever seen.

You are a fucking disgrace OP and this is not the standard I would have expected from the

Divineds chosen ones.

Max ratings should be for a killer of a killer method. Not in a thousand years should a gambling script or whatever get max ratings.

Fuck you OP. And also fuck wrecked and you too Jombah for riding hard dick.
I know there are good and unbiased dudes on Appraisers. You are not one of them. So get the fuck off.

sonex - May 4, 2019, 12:44 am

(May 3, 2019 09:25 PM)Deal Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) What the fuck is this review?

This is so biased I can't even.. It is so obvious that this review is meant to show the shitty method sellers that they should not be worried about the reviews because you guys have a hard time finding some to review.

Ouch. Could not have said it better myself.

(May 3, 2019 09:25 PM)Deal Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I know there are good and unbiased dudes on Appraisers.

This thread clearly shows you can pay for positive review thus the entire group is useless.

On a site note I've heard a rumor they share your PDF with other group members (yet they claim only the reviewer reads it) and eventually one of them leaks it ?

BTC - May 4, 2019, 12:56 am

(May 4, 2019 12:44 AM)sonex Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) On a site note I've heard a rumor they share your PDF with other group members (yet they claim only the reviewer reads it) and eventually one of them leaks it ?

Those are some pretty serious allegations, you should back up with some sort of proof / reasoning rather than just "I've heard a rumor".

In no way am I disagreeing with you or stating my opinion on this matter, I have no opinion on whether they do or don't do it. I just fear that spreading rumor / propaganda is recipe for disaster, nobody is to know whether you heard this rumor from somebody in which their word should be trusted.

As per the review itself, regardless of ratings and such, I have not seen the method in my own perspective, and can not give an informed decision so I should not judge what the OP has stated. This would make me ignorant.

However, I can appreciate the time and efforts put in to writing such a lengthy, high quality post.

Spaark - May 4, 2019, 1:00 am

(May 4, 2019 12:44 AM)sonex Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This thread clearly shows you can pay for positive review thus the entire group is useless.

On a site note I've heard a rumor they share your PDF with other group members (yet they claim only the reviewer reads it) and eventually one of them leaks it ?

I've personally never been offered payment for a positive review. Reviews by Appraisers members are supposed to be unbiased and critical. Wolf has redone this review as a result of public scrutiny and internal pressure on his standard of work. It's his first review for the group and I can assure you he's learnt his lesson.

I think it's immature of you to go after the whole group over this single review. Not to mention claim that we spread methods. This is simply untrue.

Deal - May 4, 2019, 1:01 am

Oh no I can't cope. You literally changed a rating from 11/10 to 6.5/10. This proves that the review was in the beginning very biased. An update to everyone that didn't read before:

The ratings were changed. Before they were:

11/10
10/10
10/10
11/10

Won't comment more on the thread. I appreciate that you have thought about what I said, and hope that next time you will be objective in your review. Because for sure things like this damages the reputation of the appraisers.

• Enlil Wolf • - May 4, 2019, 1:15 am

(May 4, 2019 01:01 AM)Deal Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Oh no I can't cope. You literally changed a rating from 11/10 to 6.5/10. This proves that the review was in the beginning very biased. An update to everyone that didn't read before:

The ratings were changed. Before they were:

11/10
10/10
10/10
11/10

Won't comment more on the thread. I appreciate that you have thought about what I said, and hope that next time you will be objective in your review. Because for sure things like this damages the reputation of the appraisers.

At first, I thought I wouldn't reply back because I didn't know what to respond back as but I want you to know that I take constructive criticism very seriously.

I appreciate the fact that you think well of our Group and took the time to express your opinions on why you thought my review was biased. I took that into serious consideration and redid the whole review looking at it from a critical point of view. I just want to clarify that I am new to the whole point of reviewing where I am not doing a review based on my experience & myself but I am also now representing a standard set by the group. It's hardly been a few hours since I joined but I am willing to learn and improve myself. I clearly saw the flaws I had in my review because of which I re-did the whole thing.

Rest assured, my future reviews will be far harsher & critical and judged based on what it is rather by who it is from.

But since writing is something I love to do and I am sincerely very sorry for my mistake and I apologize to each and every one of you including all the members of Appraisers publicly. Hope you all take my apology into consideration.

Regards, Wolf.

BTC - May 4, 2019, 1:21 am

(May 4, 2019 01:15 AM)EnlilWolf Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) At first, I thought I wouldn't reply back because I didn't know what to respond back as but I want you to know that I take constructive criticism very

seriously.

I took that into serious consideration and redid the whole review looking at it from a critical point of view.

This is extremely respectable and honorable, takes a real man to admit their faults and attempt to correct them. You also handled in a much more professional manner than the users who were so clearly angered by your initial review.

Quote: "If you make a mistake and do not correct it, this is called a mistake." -Confucius

sonex - May 4, 2019, 1:24 am

(May 4, 2019 01:00 AM)Spaark Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think it's immature of you to go after the whole group over this single review. Not to mention claim that we spread methods. This is simply untrue.

I think it's more immature to say I claimed something I obviously did not. I've said I heard a rumor, it's up to you or someone else figure whether it's the truth or not.

The obvious lack of your reviews recently + the recent review (this one) gives me right to state my opinion based on the facts I've seen. I'm not going after your group lmao dont get salty for no reason. Official Reviewers back in the days had issues cause it's hard to trust individuals so I somehow doubt you were able to deal with it since I'm sitting here reading 11/10 review for a GAMBLING METHOD.

I personally dont care but your reviews are far from transparent although you present them that way. If the public criticism makes you change ratings, what does money do then? I rest my case (not that I had any lol).

Spaark - May 4, 2019, 1:38 am

(May 4, 2019 01:24 AM)sonex Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think it's more immature to say I claimed something I obviously did not. I've said I heard a rumor, it's up to you or someone else figure whether it's the truth or not.

The obvious lack of your reviews recently + the recent review (this one) gives me right to state my opinion based on the facts I've seen. I'm not going after your group lmao dont get salty for no reason. Official Reviewers back in the days had issues cause it's hard to trust individuals so I somehow doubt you were able to deal with it since I'm sitting here reading 11/10 review for a GAMBLING METHOD.

I personally dont care but your reviews are far from transparent although you present them that way. If the public criticism makes you change ratings, what does money do then? I rest my case (not that I had any lol).

I understand where you're coming from. But as I said, this review was altered by public scrutiny as well as internal standards within the group. We were not happy with it and asked him to have it redone. I'm sure we had similar reactions reading the initial review, it was very poor and lacking in the quality aspects Appraisers and Reviewers should be known for. It wasn't what should bare our groups name and I think Wolf understands that now. Also, to address the lack of reviews recently: We've only recently started reviews again. The group was wiped due to mass inactivity and new members including myself were added within the past week.

In regards to these rumours. I must've misread what you said, but yeah, I want to put it to rest. Anyone found spreading methods will be blacklisted from the group, it's something we take seriously. Otherwise, I'll personally take on your criticism and I'm sure more scrutiny will be put into the quality expected of our members into the future.

Thanks sonex.

Divined - May 4, 2019, 6:16 am

(May 4, 2019 01:24 AM)sonex Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think it's more immature to say I claimed something I obviously did not. I've said I heard a rumor, it's up to you or someone else figure whether it's the truth or not.

The obvious lack of your reviews recently + the recent review (this one) gives me right to state my opinion based on the facts I've seen. I'm not going after your group lmao dont get salty for no reason. Official Reviewers back in the days had issues cause it's hard to trust individuals so I somehow doubt you were able to deal with it since I'm sitting here reading 11/10 review for a GAMBLING METHOD.

I personally dont care but your reviews are far from transparent although you present them that way. If the public criticism makes you change ratings, what does money do then? I rest my case (not that I had any lol).

Our group member already had a talking to about this shortly after the review was posted and this won't happen again.

SUI-3183372 - May 4, 2019, 11:36 am

(May 4, 2019 01:15 AM)EnlilWolf Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) At first, I thought I wouldn't reply back because I didn't know what to respond back as but I want you to know that I take constructive criticism very seriously.

I appreciate the fact that you think well of our Group and took the time to express your opinions on why you thought my review was biased. I took that into serious consideration and redid the whole review looking at it from a critical point of view. I just want to clarify that I am new to the whole point of reviewing where I am not doing a review based on my experience & myself but I am also now representing a standard set by the group. It's hardly been a few hours since I joined but I am willing to learn and improve myself. I clearly saw the flaws I had in my review because of which I re-did the whole thing.

Rest assured, my future reviews will be far harsher & critical and judged based on what it is rather by who it is from.

But since writing is something I love to do and I am sincerely very sorry for my mistake and I apologize to each and every one of you including all the members of Appraisers publicly. Hope you all take my apology into consideration.

Regards, Wolf.

Too bad you've destroyed your accountability already.

Either you were bought, you were using your position to promote a friend, or you simply do not understand what you are reviewing. There's no other excuse for the initial review that you gave, and any of these reasons is enough for me to disregard any review you post ever again as nothing more than biased or paid for rubbish.

You did yourself a great disservice by allowing your friends to manipulate you into looking like being a giant shill.

This is why Omni needs to bring back an official Reviewers group with a leader who won't stand for bullshit like this. Before this I knew any "review group" that wasnt properly managed would just be a cesspool of abuse, and because of this you've done a terrific job of verifying that appraisers is no

different.

My opinion of appraisers at this point is it likely a circle jerk of friends vouching for each other and their friends or vouching for money. Cool group.

Spaark - May 4, 2019, 4:33 pm

(May 4, 2019 11:36 AM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is why Omni needs to bring back an official Reviewers group with a leader who won't stand for bullshit like this. Before this I knew any "review group" that wasn't properly managed would just be a cesspool of abuse, and because of this you've done a terrific job of verifying that appraisers is no different.

My opinion of appraisers at this point is it likely a circle jerk of friends vouching for each other and their friends or vouching for money. Cool group.

I don't know what makes you think Divined stood for this. He was heavily criticised and asked to do it again. Appraisers isn't taking money from anyone, and furthermore, if any circle jerking or favouritism is shown in reviews they will be heavily criticised just like we have this one. Divined went to pretty brutal effort to ensure this doesn't happen again. Not a single Appraisers member wasn't shocked by how poor this initial review was.

Please don't make blanket statements on the group after this users gross misjudgement.

SUI-3183372 - May 4, 2019, 7:17 pm

(May 4, 2019 04:33 PM)Spaark Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't know what makes you think Divined stood for this. He was heavily criticised and asked to do it again. Appraisers isn't taking money from anyone, and furthermore, if any circle jerking or favouritism is shown in reviews they will be heavily criticised just like we have this one. Divined went to pretty brutal effort to ensure this doesn't happen again. Not a single Appraisers member wasn't shocked by how poor this initial review was.

Please don't make blanket statements on the group after this users gross misjudgement.

I never said anyone stood for it, however this shit has your branding on it and it was by a member of your group, so it's a representation of your entire organization... I mean it's not like you guys are pumping out reviews with any degree of regularity, I'm just basing my opinions off of what I've seen, and what I've seen thus far is pretty pathetic. I can form whatever opinion I want based on the information I've been presented, and if the conclusion I've come to bothers you, then do something to change it by showing us the positive aspects of your group.

Everyone knows a reviewers styled group has the potential to be rampant with corruption and back-room deals. Do everything right, and your group has the potential to play a nice little role here. However, once people catch a whiff of something shady going on, anyone smart is going to jump on your case right away. I don't know if people are writing reviews for money, but there's little no reason why the initial review posted would have existed for any reason other than some shady business going on. I am certain the OP of this thread benefited, or attempted to benefit, in some capacity, based on their initial review.

CPA Exposé - May 5, 2019, 7:38 pm

Lol the "updated" review is still blatantly biased and sketchy af.

Train your reviewers not to give tips on how to make the method work better... it's not their job to do that.

And not to mention that the seller is only selling 10 and you think he won't sell more than 10. Stop trying to back up their bullshit scarcity tactic..

Or that they made \$200 profit "testing it" and don't even show any proof?

This is pure bullshit lol

This review is not unbiased whatsoever.

Even if you are a good leader it's impossible for you to know if they are bribed or spreading methods (assuming a good method actually exists in these ebooks) . You can't control people outside of your own group forum section.

This is a drama/shit show waiting to happen.

Seen it all before.

Very bold to state that members should wait for vouches from you guys before buying anything.

You're not any more worthy than anyone else to make those calls.

I've seen the most respected members do shitty things over the years. Trust no one. A fancy user bar proves nothing.

Quick - May 5, 2019, 7:55 pm

(May 4, 2019 11:36 AM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) My opinion of appraisers at this point is it likely a circle jerk of friends vouching for each other and their friends or vouching for money. Cool group.

Is your opinion based on proofs ? Or is it just based on anger and pure subjectivity ? You need to check your facts before accusing a whole group of being "friends vouching for money", this opinion by itself is biased.

SUI-3183372 - May 5, 2019, 9:58 pm

(May 5, 2019 07:55 PM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Is your opinion based on proofs? Perhaps you didn't read the OP....

(May 5, 2019 07:55 PM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Or is it just based on anger
What do I have to be angry about. I am unaffected by your group.

(May 5, 2019 07:55 PM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You need to check your facts
Do I? We're posting on a thread that was obviously made with the intent to mislead others at the benefit of the E-book author. Either the author of this review was paid, or they were doing a favor for a friend. Either way YOUR GROUP is at fault here. You need to check yourself.

(May 5, 2019 07:55 PM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) this opinion by itself is biased.
Explain how I have an ounce of bias in this argument.

BTC - May 5, 2019, 10:16 pm

I think is important people understand the definition of bias. It is extremely important when speaking on such serious terms, I am not going to name anybody as I do not want to instigate arguments or debate, this is not my place to do so.

Quote:A preference or an inclination, especially one that inhibits impartial judgment. Source: The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language,4th Edition

I believe that actions speak much louder than words, and I hope everyone is willing to give the

group "Appraisers" the chance to redeem them self within your personal views. I truly believe that this mistake can be overlooked in the future given high quality, unbiased and extensive appraisals moving forward.

I understand people's frustrations, and I am not choosing sides. I just prefer to play devil's advocate in this situation, you are all entitled to your opinions / views on the matter. I am not here to say my opinion is correct, or to argue the semantics of this. I do believe slandering other members or their morals based on one user's actions is a bit harsh, but that is just my own opinion. This, my reply, is definition-ally a bias opinion, I am open to state that given the fact it evidently needs to be defined for some users.

I do believe the intentions from the group leaders are right, and god knows it is not an easy task to train all members. Perhaps some sort of screening process from the leaders prior to the public posting of these appraisals would not be a bad idea. However I am not in the group or leading the group, so my suggestion is entirely in the card deck of the leaders on whether they view this as a viable option in their infrastructure. Even having a member appointed in the group who has a specific task to look over all these appraisals, and approve them to be posted could be sufficient. This would clear up much confusion, and possibly prevent future occurrences such as this appraisal.

Given the scarcity of users as well high quality users, comparing the new era of appraisers to the old era, is difficult. Many users have told me in those years, the forum was not only much more active but likely a larger variety of high quality / unbiased users to have in groups such as the Appraisers. Not to say the users in the group are not of high quality or unbiased, just there will always be some bad apples given the circumstances, within my own personal views.

I will reiterate this as I feel the importance is high. I am a huge believer that actions speak louder than words. I hope all of you, are open minded to the idea that this mistake can be redeemed moving forward.

Quick - May 6, 2019, 1:45 am

(May 5, 2019 09:58 PM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Perhaps you didn't read the OP....

What do I have to be angry about. I am unaffected by your group.

Do I? We're posting on a thread that was obviously made with the intent to mislead others at the benefit of the E-book author. Either the author of this review was paid, or they were doing a favor for a friend. Either way YOUR GROUP is at fault here. You need to check yourself.

Explain how I have an ounce of bias in this argument.

You're judging an entire group based on a single review made by a member who had joined hours ago, and which responsibly admitted his fault and lack of experience and did his best to correct that. So If we're using your logic of one citizen commits a mistake, the entire population is at fault.

Deal - May 6, 2019, 2:16 am

(May 6, 2019 01:45 AM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're judging an entire group based on a single review made by a member who had joined hours ago, and which responsibly admitted his fault and lack of experience and did his best to correct that. So If we're using your logic of one citizen commits

a mistake, the entire population is at fault.

There are good dudes in Appraisers. But BV1 is right about people not trusting the OP.

He did not do his best to correct it, he literally proved that he was a biased cunt by changing a 11/10 rating to 6.5/10.

I agree with not judging a whole team by an action committed by one member. But I have no clue why that idiot hasn't been kicked. A group like this should have zero tolerance. It is not about making mistakes, because as a part of Appraisers you all have a responsibility.

Imagine if this wasn't corrected, how many people do you think would have bought this product thinking it was 11/10. To then find out that it's just another shitty gambling script or whatever. You guys have a serious responsibility, because if I had trusted a review that stated that a product is flawless, and maybe spent hundreds of dollars to find out it is utter shit, then I would be so pissed.

Therefore there should not be any second chances in cases like this. And it's really bad for Appraisers as a whole, because as BV1 says, people that do not know the individual members only knows what they see. When they see a shitshow like this then that is what they base their opinion on.

I know Spaark, and I have spoken to you a few times. You are good dudes so if you posted a review I would value it higher than a lot of other reviews. But if I hadn't known you then I would judge based on this review which is utter shite.

Zexi - May 6, 2019, 2:28 am

(May 4, 2019 01:15 AM)EnlilWolf Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Rest assured, my future reviews will be far harsher & critical and judged based on what it is rather by who it is from.

Why the fuck would Appraisers take someone who judges the ebook based on who it is from?
Lmao

Funniest shit is when the Ebook/Method seller says EnlilWolf's reviews are always top of the line ?

Divined - May 6, 2019, 5:38 am

(May 4, 2019 11:36 AM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Too bad you've destroyed your accountability already.

Either you were bought, you were using your position to promote a friend, or you simply do not understand what you are reviewing. There's no other excuse for the initial review that you gave, and any of these reasons is enough for me to disregard any review you post ever again as nothing more than biased or paid for rubbish.

You did yourself a great disservice by allowing your friends to manipulate you into looking like being a giant shill.

This is why Omni needs to bring back an official Reviewers group with a leader who won't stand for bullshit like this. Before this I knew any "review group" that wasn't properly managed would just be a cesspool of abuse, and because of this you've done a terrific job of verifying that appraisers is no different.

My opinion of appraisers at this point is it likely a circle jerk of friends vouching for each other and their friends or vouching for money. Cool group.

Stop assuming things, I did not stand for this and the user was promptly talked to and warned minutes after posting the review and was told to not use numbers in his reviews because we want users purchasing the product to come in their own conclusion after reading the review. Also your last paragraph alone honestly is something I can't take that seriously since you joined in '16, you're acting like there's been a dozen "review groups" since then or something like that. Not to mention that "Reviewers" also had bad apples that were dealt with. Mistakes are made, lessons are learned.

Wre@ked - May 6, 2019, 5:54 am

I have refrained from posting on this because I felt that it didn't involve me given this seemed to be more of group issues. I know there is a very bad stigma against gambling methods as a whole and I 100% get it. I have fallen victim to testing 100's over the years and unfortunately, 99% of them ended the same way, with me losing my money. Over my experience with testing, I have taken bits and pieces and created my own which has worked the best for me and I have had success with. I have been nothing but transparent in my thread and repeated over and over that this is gambling and there is always a risk. I in no way want to give people a false sense of hope that they can "change their life" with this method. I simply know, I have been successful doing it the way I do it and if people want to take that risk and make some profit then so be it; I'll be there to help them through it.

Also, I want to attempt to clear both mine and wolfs name. I have known him for a little over 2 weeks now. I first met him when he offered to do a vouch on my original method I posted. I really enjoyed his style of writing and how HQ his vouch was so when I released another method it was a no brainer to ask him to do it again. There was in no way shape or form ANY sort of payment for him to do this vouch. The only money I had ever sent was when he tested my first method. [HERE](#) I sent him \$15 in XLM to use to test the method because I was so confident in it. I have no problem admitting to that because I aim, to be honest, transparent, and I highly trust in my method. Now whether he broke and type of group policy I can speak to that is completely an internal issue and I have no reason to comment on that. However, from my perspective, he wrote an unbiased review for my method. He questioned it, tested it for over 24 hours, and from what he told me made a decent profit with it.

I appreciate anyone who takes the time to read this. This was not my intention to have this blow up into something bigger than what it was simply supposed to be, a vouch.

Jombah - May 6, 2019, 6:49 am

99.9% of people who are going to read the Appraiser's reviews on products will NOT even read this thread.

Nobody's "credibility" has been ruined (lol that someone actually said that)

Essentially, there are 2 pages of like 3 people arguing against each other. Take a deep breath and relax

SUI-3183372 - May 6, 2019, 7:44 am

(May 6, 2019 01:45 AM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're judging an entire group based on a single review made by a member who had joined hours ago, and which responsibly admitted his fault and lack of experience and did his best to correct that. So If we're using your logic of one citizen commits a mistake, the entire population is at fault.

LAUGH. MY. FUCKING. ASS. OFF.

You're an exclusive group, not a race of people. You choose who does and doesn't get into your group, and from there, anyone within your group is a representation of your organization. You can't just add someone to your group then act like anything they do doesn't directly reflect onto the rest of you.

Terrible attempt comparing your group to a race or population of people...

(May 6, 2019 05:38 AM)Divined Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Stop assuming things, I did not stand for this and the user was promptly talked to and warned minutes after posting the review and was told to not use numbers in his reviews because we want users purchasing the product to come in their own

conclusion after reading the review. Also your last paragraph alone honestly is something I can't take that seriously since you joined in '16, you're acting like there's been a dozen "review groups" since then or something like that. Not to mention that "Reviewers" also had bad apples that were dealt with. Mistakes are made, lessons are learned.

Come on man, you joined in '14 and have 2 years on this account. Why are you trying to use join date to act as if that has any major indication on whether or not I should know how a corrupt review group is a bad review group...?

Anyways, If you want to get technical, I joined in Feb '09 (not that it's important). Have owned 3 groups (sold my last one in '12), led 2 additional, was part of the original Reviewers... which is why I know first hand how bad shit gets when this is poorly ran. If ANYONE is qualified to weigh in on this, you're talking to them. Just because you joined long after my peak activity doesn't mean I'm clueless (you joined 3 days before I took a 25 month hiatus). HF just isn't where I spend my much of my time now, nor is it how I make a living anymore, so my original account was closed due to inactivity.

Again, I'm not saying you're standing for this, I'm just saying it happened, it's a really bad look for your group, and from the outside, as someone who doesn't really see your group do much at all, when I do finally see something and it's this blatantly fucked up, it causes one to make assumptions about how the rest of the group is ran. It makes one wonder what other shady back room deals may be happening. I'll take your word for it that no one else in your group was ok with this, but I'd rather see that than just be told it

Quick - May 6, 2019, 8:37 am

(May 6, 2019 07:44 AM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're an inclusive group, not a race of people. You choose who does and doesn't get into your group, and from there, anyone within your group is a representation of your organization.

Terrible attempt comparing your group to a race or population of people, Imfao...

You only read my answers the way it suits you the best, and you interpret them in a disfigured way in order to harm the group's reputation as much as you can. The main purpose of my answer was to counter your biased judgement on the entire group which stated : "My opinion of appraisers at this point is it likely a circle jerk of friends vouching for each other and their friends or vouching for money. Cool group.". This isn't true at all, and based purely on an innocent mistake of only one of the members who did the effort to correct himself as soon as possible. If you got any proofs that all appraisers are corrupted jerks who provide biased reviews for sellers, please let me know. Otherwise I deem that your claim is founded on subjective anger towards us.

SUI-3183372 - May 6, 2019, 9:11 am

(May 6, 2019 08:37 AM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You only read my answers the way it suits you the best, and you interpret them in a disfigured way in order to harm the group's reputation as much as you can. The main purpose of my answer was to counter your biased judgement on the entire group which stated : "My opinion of appraisers at this point is it likely a circle jerk of friends vouching for each other and their friends or vouching for money. Cool group.". This isn't true at all, and based purely on an innocent mistake of only one of the members who did the effort to correct himself as soon as possible. If you got any proofs that all appraisers are corrupted jerks who provide biased reviews for sellers, please let me know. Otherwise I deem that your claim is founded on subjective anger towards us.

You're using a lot of words that I don't think you understand, or else you wouldn't be saying them.

Let me make this as simple as possible for you:

1. I saw a representation of your group.
2. I formed an opinion of your group based on this representation.

3. I've since been told this is not a good representation of your group, but haven't been shown anything actually proving the contrary.
4. My opinion is subject to change over time as I see fit.

So this leaves me with 4 questions:

1. How am I angry?
2. How am I biased?
3. Do you know what biased means?
4. Why are you faulting me for forming an opinion based on what I've seen?

Maybe if you don't want people forming an opinion on your group you shouldn't do anything in public, as this will only lead to others forming their own opinions, and that seems to upset you.

Quick - May 6, 2019, 1:42 pm

(May 6, 2019 09:11 AM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're using a lot of words that I don't think you understand, or else you wouldn't be saying them.

Let me make this as simple as possible for you:

1. I saw a representation of your group.
2. I formed an opinion of your group based on this representation.
3. I've since been told this is not a good representation of your group, but haven't been shown anything actually proving the contrary.
4. My opinion is subject to change over time as I see fit.

So this leaves me with 4 questions:

1. How am I angry?
2. How am I biased?
3. Do you know what biased means?
4. Why are you faulting me for forming an opinion based on what I've seen?

Maybe if you don't want people forming an opinion on your group you shouldn't do anything in public, as this will only lead to others forming their own opinions, and that seems to upset you. You're free to form whatever opinion you'd like, on my turn, I'll answer your 4 questions as simply as I can :

1+2 : You judged an entire group based on one review, which for me seems that you were just looking for the slightest opportunity to criticize the group.

3. I won't bother answering this one.
4. I do not even know you, If I went on threads and saying BV1 is a jerk who is corrupted without having any proof, wouldn't my opinion be faulty ?

SUI-3183372 - May 6, 2019, 5:39 pm

(May 6, 2019 01:42 PM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 4. I do not even know you, If I went on threads and saying BV1 is a jerk who is corrupted without having any proof, wouldn't my opinion be faulty ?

Depends, does the thread also literally demonstrate me being corrupt like this thread did for appraisers?.

Quick - May 6, 2019, 7:44 pm

(May 6, 2019 05:39 PM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Depends, does the thread also literally demonstrate me being corrupt like this thread did for appraisers?.

I'll just ask you a simple question again : Does this thread prove in any way that I'm corrupt ? (Not to mention the other members etc) Keeping this simple for you.

SUI-3183372 - May 6, 2019, 8:02 pm

(May 6, 2019 07:44 PM)Quick Hit Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'll just ask you a simple question again : Does this thread prove in any way that I'm corrupt ? (Not to mention the other members etc) Keeping this simple for you.

No.

What this thread represents is there is corruption within appraisers, and what is unknown is how far it goes. Does it end with the OP of this thread, are there a few people who are up to shady things, or is everyone there engaged in back room deals? That's a question I can't specifically answer, only that we can gather that it's somewhere between those two ends.

What actually would have been a great indicator of how your group operates is what happened to OP after this post, however as fate will have it, they got themselves banned. What I can gather from this topic is one of two things happened: 1. OP was engaging in some sort of back room deal to exchange a favorable review for something else, or 2. OP had no fucking idea what they were looking at, and somehow decided to give the product in question a more than perfect review for no reason other than negligence and incompetence. I'd wager it's the former, but either would warrant an immediate dismissal from any review styled group that wanted to maintain a certain level of integrity.

Happeh - May 6, 2019, 11:58 pm

(May 4, 2019 01:00 AM)Spaark Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I've personally never been offered payment for a positive review. Reviews by Appraisers members are supposed to be unbiased and critical. Wolf has redone this review as a result of public scrutiny and internal pressure on his standard of work. It's his first review for the group and I can assure you he's learnt his lesson.

I think it's immature of you to go after the whole group over this single review. Not to mention claim that we spread methods. This is simply untrue.

Have editors QC before they're pushed next time, just like the reviewers used to do.

Spaark - May 7, 2019, 12:06 am

(May 6, 2019 11:58 PM)Happeh Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Have editors QC before they're pushed next time, just like the reviewers used to do.

We have committed to doing this into the future.

Thanks Happeh :)

Happeh - May 7, 2019, 2:37 am

(May 7, 2019 12:06 AM)Spaark Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) We have committed to doing this into the future.

Thanks Happeh :)

Not sure how many decisions you can make, but I'd suggest having someone give you advice on how the Reviewers were run, they weren't perfect but it was one of the best systems and its a reason people still speak of them so highly. Don't be afraid to copy what works.

sonex - May 7, 2019, 5:24 am

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5967182>

Why is your member who clearly says is no expert reviews methods he has no clue about? The method might as well be public shit and he still wouldn't know.

If you're going to show your group value and be trusted throughout the community you might want to hand-pick whom you give the authority to review products. His review is absolutely useless and a waste of both time and space.

You simply can not go around reviewing methods just for the sake of it, one can only assume you need some sort of experience in order to present the best review possible. Not the mention there is drama in the thread as well -

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5967182&pid=58546104#pid58546104>

Apparently ZERO effort has been invested in that review. Two shit reviews in two days. Now you're gonna say it was just a mistake by one of the members? No actually I'm honestly starting to think you're skecthy as fuck or you just run this shit for giggles.

SUI-3183372 - May 7, 2019, 8:25 am

(May 7, 2019 05:24 AM)sonex Wrote: [\[CITE\] https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5967182](https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5967182)

Why is your member who clearly says is no expert reviews methods he has no clue about? The method might as well be public shit and he still wouldnt know.

If you're going to show your group value and be trusted throughout the community you might want to hand-pick whom you give the authority to review products. His review is absolutely useless and a waste of both time and space.

You simply can not go around reviewing methods just for the sake of it, one can only assume you need some sort of experience in order to present the best review possible. Not the mention there is drama in the thread as well -

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5967182&pid=58546104#pid58546104>

Apparently ZERO effort has been invested in that review. Two shit reviews in two days. Now you're gonna say it was just a mistake by one of the members? No actually I'm honestly starting to think you're skecthy as fuck or you just run this shit for giggles.

This.

My initial thoughts were surely there was abuse going on, that the review was so skewed and blatantly wrong in so many ways, that it had to be paid for. However, [now that Caligio has entered the ring](#), I'm wondering if I was mistaken. I'm willing to fully admit that I may have been quick to jump to the abuse hype train, when it's obvious the issue is closer to utter incompetence by the reviewers themselves.

Yesterday I thought, "Surely there's nobody out there that ACTUALLY believes this is an 11/10 product. Surely this reviewer is on drugs or is bought." However, I didn't take two key possibilities into consideration:

1. The reviewer could be utterly and totally incompetent
2. The person who assigned this product to the reviewer could be entirely negligent

Now that we have Caligio's review as a second piece of work to witness, it's much easier to gather that reviews are assigned to reviewers with negligence, and reviewers simply don't understand what the fuck they're talking about. I feel like if I wanted a proper description on whether or not an object is shiny I may be able to depend on you guys... but fuck me if you think I'm going to trust you to read a technical piece of information, process it, and then assign a rating to it, all while you guys have people like Wolf and Caligio talking about shit they have no experience with. If I'm looking for an E-Book to help me learn to grow a social media presence, and I read a review about an ebook, it better come from somebody who ACTUALLY has any fucking idea about Instagram growth, not some retard who's going to post "Well I'm no expert but it sure does have a lot of words." Either assign reviews responsibly and decline to review a product when you don't have any knowledgeable reviewers on the subject, or prepare to lose any remaining shreds of accountability you may still

have.

Divined - May 7, 2019, 8:36 am

(May 7, 2019 08:25 AM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This.

My initial thoughts were surely there was abuse going on, that the review was so skewed and blatantly wrong in so many ways, that it had to be paid for. However, now that Caligio has entered the ring, I'm wondering if I was mistaken. I'm willing to fully admit that I may have been quick to jump to the abuse hype train, when it's obvious the issue is closer to utter incompetence by the reviewers themselves.

Yesterday I thought, "Surely there's nobody out there that ACTUALLY believes this is an 11/10 product. Surely this reviewer is on drugs or is bought." However, I didn't take two key possibilities into consideration:

1. The reviewer could be utterly and totally incompetent
2. The person who assigned this product to the reviewer could be entirely negligent

Now that we have Caligio's review as a second piece of work to witness, it's much easier to gather that reviews are assigned to reviewers with negligence, and reviewers simply don't understand what the fuck they're talking about. I feel like if I wanted a proper description on whether or not an object is shiny I may be able to depend on you guys... but fuck me if you think I'm going to trust you to read a technical piece of information, process it, and then assign a rating to it, all while you guys have people like Wolf and Caligio talking about shit they have no experience with. If I'm looking for an E-Book to help me learn to grow a social media presence, and I read a review about an ebook, it better come from somebody who ACTUALLY has any fucking idea about Instagram growth, not some retard who's going to post "Well I'm no expert but it sure does have a lot of words." Either assign reviews responsibly and decline to review a product when you don't have any knowledgeable reviewers on the subject, or prepare to lose any remaining shreds of accountability you may still have.

This is starting to get funny now, reading these replies among what has been said on private chats which I've also been shown. We are not recognized by an official power, we are not admins dishing out wrongful bans, we are not mentors dishing out wrong warnings. Users are free to deny giving a product for a review to the people PMing them or asking for them on their thread. Sure, he might've said he's not an expert but he did say that he's been doing his research on the subject the past month. He handled the review perfectly, you will not know if his review is wrong or right unless you purchase the product (if a review is bought and the product is shit, then it will be blatant). Appraisers are not here to tell you whether to purchase a product or not, we are here to review products, appraise products if we are allowed to do so by thread owners among other things and always give our honest opinion.

Also I ask you to not call my users "retards", anyone who stoops down to that level shows their mental capacity themselves and from what I've read from your threads I really did hope you were better than that.

SIM-1729678 - May 7, 2019, 8:40 am

Reviews like these mean nothing to the community, sorry to say.

Spoiler [\(Click to View\)](#)

BTC - May 7, 2019, 8:44 am

(May 6, 2019 11:58 PM)Happeh Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Have editors QC before they're pushed next time, just

like the reviewers used to do. Great idea!

Mann I suggested this soo many posts ago in this thread ?

On a side note: Why is everybody still arguing about this :(If you don't like someone's review or vouch copy on a sales thread, you just know not to purchase that product now. Not like I go and flame that person who left a "vouch" along with all their friends who do the exact same thing! Let's be real there are a couple members who accept money for "promoting products" ;) You know who I'm talking about

If anybody thinks so badly of Appraisers, then you can just steer away from products specific members give reviews on, or the whole group if you feel so strongly. As an avid consumer of this forum, in my own opinion, I feel there is no need for any of this, it is becoming a huge pissing contest. This is not helping anybody, or seemingly going nowhere. Whatever the intentions of the debate, and the beginning point, each reply is becoming less and less relevant. Some people really reminding me of Ben Shapiro (not to point fingers)

SUI-3183372 - May 7, 2019, 8:48 am

(May 7, 2019 08:36 AM)Divined Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is starting to get funny now, reading these replies among what has been said on private chats which I've also been shown. We are not recognized by an official power, we are not admins dishing out wrongful bans, we are not mentors dishing out wrong warnings. Users are free to deny giving a product for a review to the people PMing them or asking for them on their thread. Sure, he might've said he's not an expert but he did say that he's been doing his research on the subject the past month. He handled the review perfectly, you will not know if his review is wrong or right unless you purchase the product (if a review is bought and the product is shit, then it will be blatant). Appraisers are not here to tell you whether to purchase a product or not, we are here to review products, appraise products if we are allowed to do so by thread owners among other things and always give our honest opinion.

Are you insinuating I was a part of these private chats, or are you just mentioning them in general, as other than being linked to Caligio's review and hours later returning a link to my reply, I haven't engaged in discussion of this topic in private with anyone other than Spaark, and that was only minutes ago.

See, this is where our opinions differ. You think the review was handled perfectly, despite his short comings on the topic. I think the review shouldn't exist at all, due to those short comings. This is the message I just sent to Spaark when he elaborated to me that products were not assigned to reviewers:

Quote:That's a terrible system though?

You(they) need to have a list of potential reviewers and where their expertise lie. Then those users need to ONLY review products within their expertise. Anything outside of that is just going to be unreliable bullshit that shouldn't be taken seriously by any potential buyers.

If I'm in the market for a method/tool on social media growth, what benefit am I gaining from a reviewer who doesn't partake in any sort of social media campaigns, yet still felt it appropriate to review the method/tool based on how they "perceive" the method/tool? Why would it be appropriate at all for these guys to be putting out official reviews, with the group's branding, on products they simply don't fully understand?

See my point is, what value does a review bring if the reviewer isn't someone who would even use the product in any serious capacity. Nobody wants to see a review saying, "I perceive this product might be good for someone who does this sort of stuff, but I can't be certain because I don't do that stuff." Even if you present that opinion in a well written and nice looking report, it's still useless information. People want reviews from people who actually understand what they're talking about, who understand the product being discussed. If anything, I'd consider these reviews posted to be misleading, as users may not be observant enough to realize the review isn't coming from someone

who is knowledgeable on the subject... If you want to make it clear that the reviews are simply only touching upon whether or not the product simply exists and appears to deliver what is promised in the description, then I think you're in a fine spot for that. However, I feel your group lacks oversight for anything more than that right now. Continuing to allow members to post reviews on products they have no business reviewing is only going to bring harm to your group, especially now that people are starting to call you out on it, they'll be watching you guys for a while looking for the next bad review to jump on.

SIM-1729678 - May 7, 2019, 8:48 am

(May 7, 2019 08:36 AM)Divined Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) SnipSo the admins and mentors are dishing out wrongful bans and warnings? Please elaborate.

Divined - May 7, 2019, 8:51 am

(May 7, 2019 08:48 AM)ScreemS Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So the admins and mentors are dishing out wrongful bans and warnings? Please elaborate.

No, I meant hypothetically if we were recognized by an official power I'd understand the sort of judgement, it'd be like an admin handing out a wrong ban or a mentor handing out a wrong warning. Sure, I'd love for us to be recognized by an official power one day but that takes practice and practice takes time.

SUI-3183372 - May 7, 2019, 9:10 am

(May 7, 2019 08:51 AM)Divined Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) No, I meant hypothetically if we were recognized by an official power I'd understand the sort of judgement, it'd be like an admin handing out a wrong ban or a mentor handing out a wrong warning. Sure, I'd love for us to be recognized by an official power one day but that takes practice and practice takes time.

That's the thing though.

You have a name: appraisers

You have a group

You have branding

I'm even curious if the [Appraisal] tag was made at your group's request

You guys have done everything possible to be as official looking as possible, without actually being official. The posts your group makes, using your name and branding, carry a lot of weight, whether or not you think they do, and worse yet, whether or not the reviews are accurate.

If you are going to go through the effort to look and feel "pseudo" official, then you have a responsibility to ensure that the reviews that your group puts out not only look nice, which you're fine on, but are posted with a high level of precision and by people who understand what they're talking about, and this is where I feel like your group falls short for reasons I made in my last post.

However, look at the OP of this topic. Look at his posting history. He could be a terrifically nice guy, could be great to be around, a hit at parties, the whole nine yards. But again, look at his posting history. He has no obvious expertise in really any relevant topics here. Maybe he could review some E-Whoring packs and verify authenticity, but he has no business giving any sort of technical review, nor does he seem qualified to judge a product based on originality.

Your reviewers are going to break you if you continue to leave them unchecked.

Divined - May 7, 2019, 9:16 am

(May 7, 2019 09:10 AM)BV1 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That's the thing though.

You have a name: appraisers

You have a group
You have branding

I'm even curious if the [Appraisal] tag was made at your group's request

You guys have done everything possible to be as official looking as possible, without actually being official. The posts your group makes, using your name and branding, carry a lot of weight, whether or not you think they do, and worse yet, whether or not the reviews are accurate.

If you are going to go through the effort to look and feel "pseudo" official, then you have a responsibility to ensure that the reviews that your group puts out not only look nice, which you're fine on, but are posted with a high level of precision and by people who understand what they're talking about, and this is where I feel like your group falls short for reasons I made in my last post.

However, look at the OP of this topic. Look at his posting history. He could be a terrifically nice guy, could be great to be around, a hit at parties, the whole nine yards. But again, look at his posting history. He has no obvious expertise in really any relevant topics here. Maybe he could review some E-Whoring packs and verify authenticity, but he has no business giving any sort of technical review, nor does he seem qualified to judge a product based on originality.

Your reviewers are going to break you if you continue to leave them unchecked.

We are not being ran as a pseudo "official", neither did we ever aim to. Omniscient was kind enough to make the Appraisal tag for my group when I branded it so and for that I am forever grateful. As it stands however we are not officially recognized by the site's administration and have no official burden to carry. Only burden we carry is obeying the site's rules. Like I said, practice makes perfect and practice takes time. I can tell you that we always strive for the most perfect review and that could still be something you can judge wrongfully so I will not say that. I will say that we always will stand by our reviews and members who do not will not be in the group for long, regardless - thank you for all of your judgement and your points that will help our group improve.

Vitani - May 7, 2019, 9:21 am

This thread is going way off topic. If you wish to discuss groups, create a thread in the correct section.

Note that it's fine to have healthy discussions, but flaming will not be tolerated.