

# COMPARATIVE REVIEW

## VB100 – WINDOWS XP SP3

*John Hawes*

Our last comparative on *Windows XP* (see *VB*, April 2009, p.15) saw a record number of entries, with what seemed like an enormous 39 products taking part. This record was broken late last year with our first look at the gleaming new *Windows 7* platform when 43 products took part. As we came around to *XP* once more, we expected to see yet another new record set, but when the test deadline came, all expectations were exceeded by a seemingly endless flood of submissions arriving in the lab team's inboxes. With new arrangements made to allow the participation of products that require Internet access to install and acquire updates, even the simple task of acquiring the products for the test became a serious test of our time and resources. Network connections slowed to a crawl thanks to the multiple large downloads, and our storage capacity began to fill ominously. All test systems were in constant use as the less flexible solutions were installed, activated, updated and snapshots taken for testing.

In the end, a monster 60 products were accepted into the test, although we made it clear to vendors who submitted multiple entries that we would only be able to test them all if time allowed. With just a month to plough through all these products, it was clearly going to be a busy time, and after some trial runs in recent tests we had plans to add yet further to the selection of performance data being gathered. As soon as circumstances allowed, we buried ourselves in the lab with plenty of hot drinks and notepaper, preparing for the long haul. If you have a day or two to spare to read through this report, we hope you'll find some of our findings informative.

### PLATFORM AND TEST SETS

Despite its now venerable age, the *XP* platform remains the most popular operating system on the planet, with most estimates agreeing that it runs on more than 50% of all computers worldwide. It is now, in a manner of speaking, a grandparent – succeeded by two newer generations of the *Windows* operating system – and is a full year into the 'extended support' phase, with the plug finally due to be pulled in four years. It seems likely that large numbers of users will stick by it for much of that time, thanks to the stability and simplicity of use for which it has acquired such a strong reputation.

Running yet another test on the platform (our tenth so far, including 64-bit editions) required little effort in the set-up phases; test images from the last round were dug

out, and a few adjustments made to fit in with changes to the lab network set-up, but no major work needed doing before fresh images were created. The systems were thus running bare *XP Professional SP3*, with no additional updates, and a handful of tools such as PDF viewers and archive tools, as per our standard operating procedure. With the unprecedented popularity of this comparative, a batch of new systems were also roped in for the test, with a near-identical environment installed on slightly more powerful hardware; these would be used for the donkey work of the big slow scans of the large test sets, while all performance-related tests would be run on the standard set of matching machines.

At the core of our performance tests are the speed sets, originally built by harvesting all files from a selection of *Windows* systems of varying degrees of lived-in-ness and dividing them by file type. These remain unchanged from the last several tests and although we hope to freshen them up in the near future, their content remains fairly reflective of normal ratios of different types of files. The content of these sets is deliberately made as common and widely used as possible, to minimize the possibility of false alarms, as the speed sets are counted as part of the false positive test. The system drive of the test machine is also considered part of the false positive test, although this should not cause any problems for any reasonably cautious product. Much of the testing using these sets is automated, and some adjustments were made to the automation scripts this month in order to gather further data from the test systems while the tests were being run; details of the methods used for this will be provided below.

The main bulk of our false positive test is labelled simply the 'clean set', and this saw some considerable expansion this month, with various new packages added including files harvested from a number of machines and CDs acquired by the lab team in recent months – a number of games and several sets of disk-burning utilities prominent among them. The set has also been pared down to exclude more obscure and insignificant items, and we plan to continue this process of tuning the set to reflect the more important items in future. For this month's test, the set contained close to half a million files.

Compiling the infected test sets has been considerably simplified of late by some improvements in automation. Ever larger numbers of new samples flood in from a growing range of sources, and are put through various types of checks and analyses before being considered for our test. These include static checking of file types and parameters, classification processes and dynamic analysis of behaviours. To save time in the tight comparative schedule, we tried to get as much of this work done as possible prior to building the sets, but as ever with the RAP sets being compiled well

into the allotted time period many of these checks had to be left until testing was well under way. For this month's test, the four weekly RAP sets seemed somewhat more even than usual, with between 8,000 and 9,000 samples in each. The trojans set was built with samples gathered in the month or so between the end of the last RAP period and the start of this one, and a considerable expansion was made to our set of worms and bots, with samples from the same period adjudged to fit into this category added to the set. The polymorphic set saw only minimal adjustments, with a number of W32/Virut strains that had recently fallen off the WildList added to the set in expanded numbers.

The WildList set itself was aligned with the latest list available on the test set deadline of 20 February, which meant that the January list (released on 17 February) just made the cut. This list included the usual smattering of new samples, dominated by Autorun and Koobface worms and online gaming password stealers. What immediately stood out, however, was yet another strain of W32/Virut, which had appeared on the list since our last test. As always, large numbers of samples were replicated from the original control sample, each one checked to prove it capable of infecting other files, and the set was closed at a total of 2,500 Virut samples – which should be plenty to thoroughly exercise each product's capabilities at detecting this complex polymorphic virus in all its disguises. Also of note this month was the return of an old complex polymorphic threat, W32/Polip, which first appeared in mid-2006 and has remained in our polymorphic sets for some time. Again, some 2,500 samples were moved to the WildList set to represent this threat.

## PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE USAGE MEASUREMENTS

For some time now we have been including a variety of performance measurements along with the detection results in these comparatives; a few years ago we added on-access speed measurements to the on-demand throughput figures, and with such an epic test before us, now seemed the perfect moment to further add to our data.

Throughout this month's test, we planned to take a selection of measurements of the usage of system resources – such as RAM and CPU cycles – at various stages and to see what data could be harvested from them for presentation in these pages. In the final reckoning, with the publication deadline already disappearing behind us and much work still to do, it seemed sensible to pull as much of this data together as possible into a simple and easy-to-read format. To this end we have focused on two simple measures: the total available memory and the percentage of CPU cycles in use, and split them into two types of measurement – with the system idle,

On-demand tests	WildList		Worms & bots		Polymorphic viruses		Trojans		Clean sets	
	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%	FP	Susp.
Agnitum	0	100.00%	105	97.96%	191	89.11%	1255	89.39%		1
AhnLab	0	100.00%	424	91.75%	8	99.59%	5703	51.78%		2
Alwil	0	100.00%	28	99.46%	507	93.28%	197	98.33%		
Arcabit	0	100.00%	747	85.47%	1319	79.03%	5781	51.12%	6	
Authentium	0	100.00%	140	97.28%	3	99.85%	1759	85.13%	4	
Avanquest	0	100.00%	46	99.11%	1989	65.32%	446	96.23%	1	
AVG	0	100.00%	17	99.67%	26	98.79%	284	97.60%		
Avira (Personal)	0	100.00%	11	99.79%	0	100.00%	148	98.75%		
Avira (Professional)	0	100.00%	11	99.79%	0	100.00%	148	98.75%		
BitDefender	0	100.00%	24	99.53%	0	100.00%	618	94.78%		
Bkis (Gateway Scan)	3	99.58%	807	84.31%	2773	51.85%	6551	44.61%		
Bkis (Home Edition)	18	97.50%	847	83.53%	2776	51.20%	6551	44.61%		
Bullguard	0	100.00%	18	99.65%	0	100.00%	316	97.33%		
CA (ISS)	0	100.00%	432	91.60%	958	92.06%	5184	56.17%		
CA (Threat Manager)	0	100.00%	430	91.64%	958	92.06%	5063	57.19%		
Central Command	0	100.00%	109	97.88%	191	89.11%	1229	89.61%		1
Check Point	1	99.9999%	56	98.91%	9	99.91%	379	96.80%		5
Defenx	0	100.00%	109	97.88%	191	89.11%	1251	89.42%		1
Digital Defender	0	100.00%	135	97.37%	191	89.11%	1338	88.69%		1
eEye Digital Security	104	99.99%	282	94.52%	288	83.47%	2764	76.63%	3	
Emsisoft	974	99.95%	10	99.81%	1285	78.59%	202	98.29%	1	1
eScan	0	100.00%	18	99.65%	0	100.00%	320	97.29%		3
ESET	0	100.00%	23	99.55%	0	100.00%	172	98.55%		
Filseclab	1548	97.97%	310	93.97%	9913	41.20%	1881	84.10%	5	1
Fortinet	0	100.00%	330	93.58%	30	99.09%	3099	73.80%	1	
Frisk	0	100.00%	185	96.40%	0	100.00%	1997	83.12%	1	
F-Secure (Client Security)	0	100.00%	18	99.65%	0	100.00%	532	95.50%		
F-Secure (PSB Workstation)	0	100.00%	18	99.65%	0	100.00%	532	95.50%		
G DATA	0	100.00%	4	99.92%	0	100.00%	11	99.91%		
Ikarus	973	99.95%	3	99.94%	1285	78.59%	142	98.80%		1
iolo	0	100.00%	186	96.38%	3	99.85%	1984	83.23%	1	

(Please refer to text for full product names)

On-demand tests contd.	WildList		Worms & bots		Polymorphic viruses		Trojans		Clean sets	
	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%	FP	Susp.
K7	0	100.00%	56	98.91%	0	100.00%	463	96.09%		1
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 2010)	0	100.00%	45	99.12%	0	100.00%	255	97.84%		
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 6)	1	99.9999%	74	98.56%	1	99.999%	545	95.39%		
Kingsoft (Advanced)	0	100.00%	1008	80.40%	2382	56.61%	10525	11.02%		
Kingsoft (Standard)	0	100.00%	934	81.84%	2382	56.61%	9352	20.93%		
Kingsoft (Swinstar)	6	99.17%	659	87.18%	3350	47.72%	6625	43.99%	1	
Lavasoft	0	100.00%	15	99.71%	1994	65.16%	107	99.10%	2	
McAfee Total Protection	0	100.00%	31	99.40%	4	99.997%	484	95.91%		
McAfee VirusScan	0	100.00%	46	99.11%	1	99.999%	786	93.35%		
Microsoft	1	99.9999%	30	99.42%	0	100.00%	543	95.41%		
Nifty Corp.	1	99.9999%	71	98.62%	1	99.999%	673	94.31%		5
Norman	104	99.99%	284	94.48%	293	82.92%	2789	76.42%	3	
PC Tools (Internet Security)	0	100.00%	25	99.51%	0	100.00%	243	97.95%		
PC Tools (Spyware Doctor)	0	100.00%	25	99.51%	0	100.00%	245	97.93%		
Preventon	0	100.00%	135	97.37%	191	89.11%	1338	88.69%		1
Proland	0	100.00%	111	97.84%	191	89.11%	1308	88.94%		1
Qihoo	0	100.00%	23	99.55%	11	99.98%	354	97.01%		
Quick Heal	0	100.00%	188	96.34%	5	99.51%	1955	83.47%		
Rising	0	100.00%	620	87.94%	1130	70.02%	5435	54.05%		
SGA Corp.	0	100.00%	26	99.49%	0	100.00%	364	96.92%		
Sophos	0	100.00%	44	99.14%	0	100.00%	554	95.32%		3
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Plus)	0	100.00%	136	97.36%	191	89.11%	1360	88.50%		
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Pro)	0	100.00%	135	97.37%	191	89.11%	1338	88.69%		
Sunbelt	0	100.00%	15	99.71%	1994	65.19%	121	98.98%	2	
Symantec (Endpoint Protection)	0	100.00%	38	99.26%	0	100.00%	324	97.26%		
Symantec (Norton Antivirus)	0	100.00%	21	99.59%	0	100.00%	392	96.69%		
Trustport	0	100.00%	3	99.94%	0	100.00%	23	99.81%		
VirusBuster	0	100.00%	109	97.88%	191	89.11%	1229	89.61%		
Webroot	0	100.00%	36	99.30%	0	100.00%	483	95.92%		

(Please refer to text for full product names)

and during heavy file accessing activity. The latter measures were all taken during our standard on-access tests, and while the data could possibly be split into different sets and so on for greater granularity, it seemed preferable to keep things simple.

The measures were taken using the *Windows Performance Monitor* via a command-line tool run as part of the normal test scripts. Figures for the RAM and CPU usage were taken every 15 seconds during the on-access speed tests while files from the speed sets and the system drive were being accessed by our opener tool, and their MD5 checksums taken. These figures were trimmed of the highest and lowest ten per cent to minimize anomalous data, and then averaged. Idle times were taken from several five-minute periods left alone throughout the course of each product's test period, again with snapshots every 15 seconds, trimmed and averaged, and both sets of figures were compared with baselines generated on identical systems with no security software present.


The final figures were calculated as the percentage increase from the baseline measures to the figures taken with each product installed and running. This should give some indication of the impact of the product on the system, although there are, of course, a number of provisos. The figures should not be taken as a definitive indicator of relative performance during all computing activities – these initial measures are something of a trial, for now presenting purely academic information on fairly unnatural behaviour. We hope in future to introduce a series of such measures taken during more generally applicable activities, to provide a more complete and accurate benchmark of variations in performance between products. As always, we aim to continue to improve and expand the value of our tests.

Speaking of which, let's start looking at those products.

### Agnitum Outpost Security Suite Pro 6.5.2514.0685

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	89.39%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.96%	<b>False positives</b>	0

First on the test bench this month was Agnitum's Outpost suite. This was provided, with the latest updates



included, as a single executable which surprised us by being a mere 51MB. Some initial problems soon revealed that this was not the full package, and a retry at downloading gleaned a much more substantial 86MB file. The installation process involved quite a number of steps, most of which related to setting up the firewall component. In all, it took around three minutes to complete and a reboot was required to finalize the installation.

The interface is clear and businesslike, with much of the focus on the firewall and intrusion-prevention components. A small amount of space in the configuration section is dedicated to the anti-malware settings, and provides some basic controls which proved ample for our requirements. The test ran through smoothly with no notable issues, apart from an interesting 'training mode' pop-up requesting permission for our file-opening utility to run.

Scanning speeds were fairly good on demand – initially somewhat slow thanks to the thorough default settings, but improving notably in the 'warm' scans, once files had become familiar. In our new performance measures, it seemed fairly light on both CPU and RAM usage, especially given the complexity of the product.


In the detection tests, after the initial false start we soon gathered some useful logs, which showed solid coverage across the standard sets and a good coverage of the reactive part of the RAP test, with a sharp drop in the proactive week. The core components of the certification sets were handled without problems though, and Agnitum takes the first of what promises to be a record batch of VB100 awards earned this month.

### AhnLab V3 Internet Security 8.0.26

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.59%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	51.78%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	91.75%	<b>False positives</b>	0

AhnLab also provided its product with updates rolled in, with the installer executable measuring around 81MB.

The set-up process was pretty speedy, with only a few 'next' clicks and it was all done in under a minute, with no reboot required. The product interface is simple and clean, with professional-looking configuration panels for the pickier



user, and it all seems to run quite sensibly. The only confusing aspect is the division of detections into malware and spyware, with separate logging and treatment of each; this resulted in occasional moments of confusion when items appeared not to have been detected but in fact the detections had simply been logged in a different place.

From there on the test ran smoothly without interruption. On-demand scanning speeds seemed fairly middle-of-the-road, with no caching of results to enhance speed. On access things were much better, with some very light lag times, and the new performance figures showed a similar dichotomy, with pretty low RAM drain but much more standard impact on CPU cycles.

Detection results were a little below par in the trojans and RAP sets, but pretty decent in the polymorphic and worms and bots sets; the WildList was handled with no problems, and with no false alarms in the clean sets *AhnLab* earns a VB100 award.


#### Alwil avast! free antivirus 100224-1

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	93.28%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	98.33%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.46%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Alwil's* thoroughly refreshed version of *avast!* was enthusiastically reviewed in these pages a few months ago (see *VB*,

January 2010, p.17), and we looked forward to seeing it back on the test bench. The company opted to enter only its free version for this test, having included both the free and professional editions in the recent *Windows 7* comparative. The product was provided with the latest updates in a compact 41MB executable, and installed in remarkable time. Only two steps were involved – one of these offered to install the *Google Chrome* browser for greater security online, while the other recommended users contribute to a community data-collection scheme. No reboot was required, and everything was happily up and running in seconds.

The new GUI remains extremely impressive both in its clear functionality and its sheer beauty. It ran fast and nimbly, with excellent responsiveness and rock-solid stability. While the new performance stats showed fairly notable increases in both RAM and CPU usage, the scanning speeds and




on-access throughput measures were excellent, especially the 'warm' times, making for some splendid figures.

Detection rates were also extremely impressive across the board, with only a rather steep decline in the RAP 'week +1' set worthy of note; no issues were observed in the clean sets or the WildList, and the free version of *avast!* is a worthy winner of a VB100 award.

#### Arcabit ArcaVir 2010 10.2.3204.4

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	79.03%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.86%	<b>Trojans</b>	51.12%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	85.47%	<b>False positives</b>	6

*Arcabit's ArcaVir* also comes pre-updated, as a 90MB executable. The first action on launching is to offer the choice of Polish or English language, reflecting the product's home market. Having made a selection, nothing seemed to happen for almost a minute while it prepared itself, and then the full installation process began. This went through the standard handful of steps before setting about its business. The process seemed to run swiftly but lingered again – while claiming to have '0 seconds' remaining – for almost two minutes. When it eventually finished, a reboot was demanded, and the whole process took four or five minutes in all. On some occasions we had some problems with the install completing, seeing errors regarding a 'configurator' module, and indeed on these occasions we noted some rather bizarre and unpredictable behaviour with little relation to the settings advertised in the interface.



The GUI itself is bright and colourful and seems fairly clearly laid out; it offers basic and advanced modes, with the latter most suitable for our requirements. It provided most of what we needed to get our work done fairly readily, and lumbered through the tests quite steadily. Some oddities were observed measuring the depth of archive scanning, when it seemed that enabling archive handling on access actually reduced the depth to which self-extracting zip files were scanned (while switching on most other types to a reasonable depth).

In the performance tests, CPU and RAM usage were not too extreme, and on-access lag times pretty light, while on-demand throughput was fairly average. In the infected sets however, several W32/Virut samples seemed to trip it up, causing the product to hang rather badly. We eventually managed to nurse it through the tests by removing samples

On-access tests	WildList		Worms & bots		Polymorphic viruses		Trojans	
	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%
Agnitum	0	100.00%	115	97.76%	191	89.11%	1373	88.39%
AhnLab	0	100.00%	424	91.75%	8	99.59%	5713	51.70%
Alwil	0	100.00%	20	99.61%	507	93.28%	172	98.55%
Arcabit	1	99.86%	751	85.39%	1319	79.03%	5811	50.87%
Authentium	0	100.00%	193	96.25%	3	99.85%	2061	82.58%
Avanquest	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AVG	0	100.00%	30	99.42%	26	98.79%	421	96.44%
Avira (Personal)	0	100.00%	15	99.71%	41	100.00%	169	98.57%
Avira (Professional)	0	100.00%	12	99.77%	0	100.00%	165	98.61%
BitDefender	0	100.00%	30	99.42%	0	100.00%	651	94.50%
Bkis (Gateway Scan)	3	99.58%	807	84.31%	2773	51.85%	6551	44.61%
Bkis (Home Edition)	18	97.50%	847	83.53%	2776	51.20%	6551	44.61%
Bullguard	0	100.00%	18	99.65%	0	100.00%	316	97.33%
CA (ISS)	0	100.00%	432	91.60%	958	92.06%	5184	56.17%
CA (Threat Manager)	0	100.00%	430	91.64%	958	92.06%	5063	57.19%
Central Command	0	100.00%	113	97.80%	191	89.11%	1319	88.85%
Check Point	1	99.9999%	99	98.07%	9	99.91%	858	92.75%
Defenx	0	100.00%	115	97.76%	191	89.11%	1373	88.39%
Digital Defender	0	100.00%	140	97.28%	191	89.11%	1421	87.99%
eEye Digital Security	123	99.99%	284	94.48%	338	81.83%	2960	74.97%
Emsisoft	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
eScan	0	100.00%	24	99.53%	0	100.00%	346	97.07%
ESET	0	100.00%	71	98.62%	0	100.00%	392	96.69%
Filseclab	2595	97.91%	295	94.26%	11413	37.25%	1718	85.48%
Fortinet	0	100.00%	330	93.58%	30	99.09%	3171	73.19%
Frisk	0	100.00%	192	96.27%	0	100.00%	2070	82.50%
F-Secure (Client Security)	0	100.00%	22	99.57%	0	100.00%	541	95.43%
F-Secure (PSB Workstation)	0	100.00%	22	99.57%	0	100.00%	541	95.43%
G DATA	0	100.00%	6	99.88%	0	100.00%	26	99.78%
Ikarus	973	99.95%	3	99.94%	1285	78.59%	142	98.80%
iolo	0	100.00%	186	96.38%	3	99.85%	1984	83.23%

(Please refer to text for full product names)

On-access tests contd.	WildList		Worms & bots		Polymorphic viruses		Trojans	
	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%	Missed	%
K7	0	100.00%	61	98.81%	0	100.00%	730	93.83%
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 2010)	0	100.00%	79	98.46%	0	100.00%	376	96.82%
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 6)	1	99.9999%	94	98.17%	1	99.999%	590	95.01%
Kingsoft (Advanced)	0	100.00%	1011	80.34%	2382	56.61%	10549	10.81%
Kingsoft (Standard)	0	100.00%	937	81.78%	2382	56.61%	9375	20.74%
Kingsoft (Swinstar)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lavasoft	2	99.72%	25	99.51%	2004	65.03%	257	97.83%
McAfee Total Protection	0	100.00%	36	99.30%	0	100.00%	601	94.92%
McAfee VirusScan	0	100.00%	49	99.05%	1	99.999%	788	93.34%
Microsoft	1	99.9999%	64	98.76%	0	100.00%	764	93.54%
Nifty Corp.	1	99.9999%	56	98.91%	1	99.999%	348	97.06%
Norman	110	99.99%	285	94.46%	338	81.83%	2944	75.11%
PC Tools (Internet Security)	0	100.00%	27	99.47%	0	100.00%	271	97.71%
PC Tools (Spyware Doctor)	0	100.00%	27	99.47%	0	100.00%	260	97.80%
Preventon	0	100.00%	140	97.28%	191	89.11%	1421	87.99%
Proland	0	100.00%	112	97.82%	191	89.11%	1310	88.92%
Qihoo	0	100.00%	23	99.55%	42	99.79%	409	96.54%
Quick Heal	0	100.00%	351	93.17%	42	96.49%	5274	55.41%
Rising	0	100.00%	620	87.94%	1130	70.02%	8376	29.18%
SGA Corp.	0	100.00%	31	99.40%	0	100.00%	397	96.64%
Sophos	0	100.00%	23	99.55%	0	100.00%	392	96.69%
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Plus)	0	100.00%	427	91.70%	191	89.11%	1384	88.30%
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Pro)	0	100.00%	140	97.28%	191	89.11%	1421	87.99%
Sunbelt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Symantec (Endpoint Protection)	0	100.00%	26	99.49%	0	100.00%	309	97.39%
Symantec (Norton Antivirus)	0	100.00%	17	99.67%	0	100.00%	209	98.23%
Trustport	0	100.00%	6	99.88%	16	100.00%	34	99.71%
VirusBuster	0	100.00%	113	97.80%	191	89.11%	1319	88.85%
Webroot	0	100.00%	58	98.87%	0	100.00%	539	95.44%

(Please refer to text for full product names)

as they caused problems. An updated DLL file was provided by the developers to demonstrate that the product had been fixed, and this seemed to render it much more stable, so the issue seems to have been a temporary one that existed around the time of the product submission date. The scan of the large clean set proved problematic too, as it seemed to run for some time but then simply vanished as soon as there were no eyes on the screen, providing no evidence that it had completed. Eventually a full run through the set was managed using only the on-access component.

Detection rates recorded here may not be entirely accurate thanks to the numerous files which were moved aside to ensure the product made it to the ends of the various scans, but it achieved some reasonable figures. Given the large number of crashes and the need to remove several Virut samples it would have been difficult to justify granting a VB100 award, but there was no need to worry about whether to make any exceptions to our usual rules as it was observed that the product had missed a single file in the WildList set on access, thanks to an incomplete set of extensions being scanned. It also alerted incorrectly on several files in the clean sets. *ArcaVir* thus does not reach the required standard for a VB100 award this month.


### Authentium Command Anti-Malware 5.1.1

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.85%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	85.13%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.28%	<b>False positives</b>	4

*Authentium's Command* product comes as a minimalist 12MB installer executable. It is provided with a special manual updating scheme for our purposes, involving an additional 22MB cab file containing the definitions. Without this extra stage, the actual set-up is extremely fast and simple, with just a couple of steps including applying a licence key; no reboot is needed and the product is providing protection within a minute.

The interface is equally simple and unfussy, with a limited selection of options but providing some sensible defaults and a few useful extras. Navigation is very easy thanks to the lack of clutter, and responsiveness and stability seemed very solid throughout testing. Scanning speeds were fairly low, and on-access overheads a little on the high side, but RAM usage was much more impressive.

Detection rates were fairly decent across the infected sets, with a gradual decline across the RAP sets as expected. The




WildList was handled without problems, but in the clean sets a handful of items were alerted on, including a version of the *Adobe Reader 6* installer which the product labelled a rootkit. *Authentium* therefore does not qualify for a VB100 award this month.

### Avanquest Double Anti-Spy Professional 1.4.4.4

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	65.32%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	N/A	<b>Trojans</b>	96.23%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.11%	<b>False positives</b>	1

The first of this month's bevy of newcomers is from *Avanquest*, a company whose name was familiar to me at least thanks to their highly active publicity department sending out frequent press releases on a wide range of products in many fields. The company's foray into anti-malware is



named *Double Anti-Spy* and boasts a dual-engine approach using technology from *Sunbelt* and *Agnitum* as the twin prongs of its defensive fork. With this approach the installer is necessarily large – at 194MB without even the latest updates. The installation process is fast, slick and professional, with only online updates available. Application of an activation key and a reboot were included in the process.

The interface is fairly simple, bulbous and colourful, with a fairly basic level of configuration – much of the layout is reminiscent of *Sunbelt* products. Running through the initial stages of the test seemed fairly straightforward, with the product operating properly and responding well to intervention. Both RAM and CPU usage were understandably heavy, and on-demand scans were long and slow, but file access lags were pretty light once the product had seen and recognized clean items.

When we got to the detection tests things got a little more tricky. Initial runs through the infected sets not only took a long time, thanks to the in-series approach of the twin engines, but were also prone to crashes, with error messages warning of services failing. Eventually, after much gentle nurturing, we managed to complete a full set of runs through the main test set, and an equally troublesome run through the RAP set showed some decent scores. On access, things were far worse, with crashes occurring repeatedly despite slowing down the file-accessing tools. After a cascade of crashes the system became barely responsive, but usually came back to life after a fairly aggressively

imposed reboot. In the end we recorded some good scores in the trojans set and nothing missed in the WildList. However, a single false alarm occurred in the clean sets, and with no on-access scores at all it was not possible to award *Avanquest* a VB100 for this performance.

### AVG Internet Security Network Edition 9.0.733

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	98.79%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.60%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.67%	<b>False positives</b>	0

AVG's suite solution remains unchanged from several tests in the past year or so. With its many components the installer

comes in at a fairly sizeable 110MB, with all updates and an activation key included for us in the pre-prepared submission. The installation process runs through only a handful of steps, and completes in a couple of minutes with no need to reboot, but at the end it insists on an 'optimization' scan to check the machine and get itself settled in. This didn't take long though, and we were soon moving along nicely.


The GUI is a little cluttered with all the different suite components, many of which seem to overlap somewhat. However, we found the advanced configuration pleasingly clear with all the required options kept together in one place, which made for easy manipulation.

On-demand scanning speeds were pretty sluggish, and access lag times fairly hefty too, while memory and processor usage was high, but did not challenge the biggest drainers on the charts.

Detection rates were fairly decent across the test sets – a little behind the front-runners in the RAP table perhaps, but still highly commendable. No issues were encountered in the WildList or clean sets, stability was solid throughout, and AVG comfortably earns another VB100 award.

### Avira AntiVir Personal 9.0.0.418

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	98.75%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.79%	<b>False positives</b>	0



*Avira* once again entered both its free and professional versions. The installer for the free 'Personal' edition came in at 30MB, with its updates as a 29MB zip archive. The install involves quite a few steps, including some after the set-up has run, but only takes around a minute to complete and does not require a reboot.

The interface is almost identical to the more familiar 'Pro' version. The fairly simple layout may be a little baffling at first for newcomers – particularly when setting up on-demand scans; it seems that only whole drives can be selected, so for our scans we used the right-click option to scan separate folders. One of the other differences between the free and pro editions is the response to on-access detections; the free edition has no option to simply block access by default, instead presenting a pop-up requiring a response. For our large on-access run through the infected test sets we resorted to leaving a heavy cup on the enter key and leaving the room for a while.



Scanning speeds were very good, and on-access lag times very low, while RAM and CPU impact was barely perceptible. In the final reckoning scores were as excellent as ever across the sets, with no issues in the WildList or clean sets, and *Avira*'s free edition earns its second VB100 award in as many attempts.



















### Avira AntiVir Professional 9.0.0.738























<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	98.75%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.79%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Much like the free edition, *AntiVir Pro* comes as a 32MB executable with a 29MB zip for the updates (in fact, the

same updater was used for both products). Again, the installation process involved several steps, this time with the additional requirement of an activation key, and even



Reactive and Proactive (RAP) detection scores	Reactive			Reactive average	Proactive	Overall average
	week -3	week -2	week -1		week +1	
Agnitum Outpost Security Suite Pro 	87.61%	75.41%	70.84%	77.95%	47.75%	70.40%
AhnLab V3 Internet Security 	68.25%	50.57%	36.40%	51.74%	21.65%	44.22%
Alwil avast! free antivirus 	96.55%	94.69%	89.78%	93.67%	52.72%	83.44%
Arcabit ArcaVir 2010	67.58%	57.78%	57.51%	60.96%	23.43%	51.58%
Authentium Command Anti-Malware	81.41%	75.54%	57.85%	71.60%	51.55%	66.59%
Avanquest Double Anti-Spy Professional	93.63%	91.68%	78.21%	87.84%	42.19%	76.43%
AVG Internet Security Network Edition 	93.55%	91.35%	81.26%	88.72%	49.28%	78.86%
Avira AntiVir Personal 	92.28%	96.19%	90.32%	92.93%	61.59%	85.10%
Avira AntiVir Professional 	92.28%	96.19%	90.32%	92.93%	61.59%	85.10%
BitDefender Antivirus 2010 	89.03%	70.53%	63.31%	74.29%	51.85%	68.68%
Bkis Bkav Gateway Scan	47.93%	43.70%	32.05%	41.23%	21.96%	36.41%
Bkis Bkav Home Edition	47.93%	43.70%	32.05%	41.23%	21.96%	36.41%
Bullguard Antivirus 	94.55%	86.08%	82.11%	87.58%	63.16%	81.47%
CA Internet Security Suite Plus 	67.23%	59.42%	64.28%	63.65%	53.20%	61.04%
CA Threat Manager 	68.69%	60.56%	65.78%	65.01%	55.35%	62.59%
Central Command Vexira Antivirus Professional 	88.47%	77.32%	71.10%	78.96%	48.28%	71.29%
Check Point Zone Alarm Suite	94.45%	95.52%	92.35%	94.11%	78.15%	90.12%
Defenx Security Suite 2010 	88.26%	77.26%	71.14%	78.89%	48.34%	71.25%
Digital Defender Antivirus 	87.42%	76.03%	69.06%	77.50%	47.64%	70.04%
eEye Digital Security Blink Professional	66.47%	57.84%	50.75%	58.35%	45.70%	55.19%
Emsisoft a-squared Anti-Malware	99.13%	99.42%	97.62%	98.72%	71.30%	91.87%
eScan Internet Security for Windows 	94.42%	85.75%	80.46%	86.88%	62.60%	80.81%
ESET NOD32 Antivirus 	94.08%	94.11%	89.18%	92.46%	78.04%	88.85%
Filseclab Twister Anti-TrojanVirus	82.74%	76.74%	67.69%	75.72%	67.66%	73.71%
Fortinet FortiClient	72.87%	69.75%	64.54%	69.05%	23.15%	57.58%
Frisk F-PROT	79.34%	72.52%	56.15%	69.34%	49.92%	64.48%
F-Secure Client Security 	91.22%	83.97%	66.53%	80.57%	55.26%	74.24%
F-Secure PSB Workstation Security 	91.22%	83.97%	66.53%	80.57%	55.26%	74.24%
G DATA Antivirus 2010 	99.09%	98.86%	91.14%	96.37%	65.25%	88.59%
Ikarus virus.utilities	98.93%	99.29%	94.64%	97.62%	68.42%	90.32%
iolo System Mechanic Professional	79.28%	72.47%	56.15%	69.30%	49.95%	64.46%

Reactive and Proactive (RAP) detection scores contd.	Reactive			Reactive average	Proactive	Overall average
	week -3	week -2	week -1		week +1	
K7 Total Security 	90.85%	85.44%	58.94%	78.41%	50.14%	71.34%
Kaspersky Anti-Virus 2010 	93.55%	96.03%	93.23%	94.27%	77.36%	90.04%
Kaspersky Anti-Virus 6 for Windows Workstations	93.24%	95.79%	92.38%	93.80%	76.47%	89.47%
Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Advanced Edition 	32.16%	24.31%	21.93%	26.13%	17.61%	24.00%
Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Standard Edition 	37.64%	36.53%	26.45%	33.54%	21.88%	30.63%
Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Swinstar Edition	42.62%	38.34%	28.81%	36.59%	22.34%	33.03%
Lavasoft Ad-Aware Professional Internet Security	96.96%	96.35%	82.57%	91.96%	62.12%	84.50%
McAfee Total Protection 	94.64%	92.87%	84.84%	90.78%	66.01%	84.59%
McAfee VirusScan Enterprise 	90.83%	89.17%	82.72%	87.57%	63.61%	81.58%
Microsoft Security Essentials	91.14%	93.06%	74.15%	86.12%	55.52%	78.47%
Nifty Corp. Security 24	93.45%	94.31%	85.59%	91.12%	62.36%	83.93%
Norman Security Suite	66.36%	57.81%	50.30%	58.16%	45.75%	55.06%
PC Tools Internet Security 2010 	93.21%	92.55%	76.19%	87.32%	34.49%	74.11%
PC Tools Spyware Doctor 	93.22%	92.58%	76.20%	87.34%	34.53%	74.13%
Preventon AntiVirus 	87.42%	76.03%	69.06%	77.50%	47.64%	70.04%
Proland Protector Plus Professional 	87.71%	76.26%	70.82%	78.26%	48.13%	70.73%
Qihoo 360 Security 	93.88%	84.32%	73.68%	83.96%	56.51%	77.10%
Quick Heal AntiVirus 2010 	78.68%	69.61%	63.17%	70.49%	44.58%	64.01%
Rising Internet Security 2010 	59.40%	42.67%	34.77%	45.62%	25.07%	40.48%
SGA Corp. SGA-VC 	94.36%	85.88%	79.65%	86.63%	62.08%	80.49%
Sophos Endpoint Security and Control 	95.90%	93.43%	90.74%	93.36%	75.43%	88.88%
SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Plus 	87.43%	76.03%	69.06%	77.51%	47.59%	70.03%
SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Pro 	87.25%	75.84%	68.98%	77.36%	47.61%	69.92%
Sunbelt VIPRE AntiVirus Premium	96.97%	96.45%	83.53%	92.31%	66.10%	85.76%
Symantec Endpoint Protection 	91.37%	90.35%	65.00%	82.24%	31.15%	69.47%
Symantec Norton Antivirus 	91.77%	90.76%	66.49%	83.00%	33.24%	70.56%
Trustport Antivirus 2010 	98.67%	96.09%	96.74%	97.17%	79.66%	92.79%
VirusBuster Professional 	88.47%	77.32%	71.10%	78.96%	48.28%	71.29%
Webroot AntiVirus with SpySweeper 	96.48%	94.12%	89.90%	93.50%	74.40%	88.72%

with some additional stages to respond to after the install proper. The whole process was complete within two minutes.


With the GUI closely resembling the free edition but providing a selection of small upgrades which made our task much easier (no heavy crockery required this time), we powered through the tests without incident. Once again performance was pretty splendid in every measurement, with only on-demand speeds not quite matching the very best on the tables.

Detection rates were, as expected, pretty identical to the free version; again no issues were observed in the core sets, and a second VB100 award goes to *Avira* in this test.

### BitDefender Antivirus 2010 13.0.19

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	94.78%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.53%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*BitDefender's* 2010 product was provided as a 126MB executable with updates etc. rolled in, and required just three clicks of a button to install. With no reboot needed, everything was complete in under a minute.



The interface has an interesting approach, providing three different levels of layout and sophistication. On the first run it offers a choice of modes, from novice to expert, and each level seems to tweak both the default set-up (such as the number of prompts and questions presented to the user) and the configuration options to be found. We mainly stuck with the 'expert' mode, with everything clearly presented and a very good depth of configuration provided.


All the tests ran through smoothly with no stability problems, and in the performance tests scanning speeds seemed a little slower than the very best, but memory and processor usage were impressively low.

In the detection tests, decent scores were achieved across the board, and a solid level was obtained in the RAP sets. Alongside its interesting approach to GUI design and reliable, stable behaviour, clean runs through the clean and WildList sets earn *BitDefender* a VB100 award.

### Bkis Bkav Gateway Scan 2759

<b>ItW</b>	99.58%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	51.85%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.58%	<b>Trojans</b>	44.61%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	84.31%	<b>False positives</b>	0

The second newcomer on this month's roster and one of the most interesting, *Bkis* hails from Vietnam, has been in business for over a decade, and is the only new entrant this month to use in-house technology alone. Two products were entered, with the 'Gateway Scan' edition coming in as a 210MB executable, with updates rolled in. Installation is a super-fast process, requiring only a couple of clicks and taking less than 30 seconds, although a reboot is needed at the end.




The interface is pared down and simple, but provides most of the required options in a simple fashion. It ran smoothly throughout, with no stability problems despite the heavy burden of our tests. Scanning speeds were somewhat on the slow side, with similarly hefty lag times on access, but memory drain was impressively low.

Detection rates were pleasingly high in the polymorphic and worms and bots sets, with a little work still to do to catch up with the leaders in the trojans and RAP sets. In the WildList, coverage was strong for a newcomer, but a small handful of items were missed. The clean sets were handled without problems though, and although no VB100 award can be granted this month, it looks likely that *Bkis* will qualify for certification very soon.

### Bkis Bkav Home Edition 2759

<b>ItW</b>	97.50%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	51.20%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	97.50%	<b>Trojans</b>	44.61%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	83.53%	<b>False positives</b>	0

The home edition of *Bkav* is pretty similar to the gateway version – to the naked eye at least. The installer came in as a 205MB executable with all the updates thrown in, and again ran at a lightning pace, this time completing in just 20 seconds before requesting a reboot. Again the layout proved a pleasure to work with, and as with the gateway edition the product proved stable and reliable throughout.



As with the other product, speeds were not amazing, but memory usage was even lower. Detection rates mirrored the gateway version fairly closely, with slightly lower scores in some sets, most likely thanks to less aggressive heuristics required by desktop users.

Again a handful of other items recently added to the WildList were missed, slightly more than the Gateway version, but with no false positive problems and a generally highly impressive product, *Bkis* shows great promise.

### Bullguard Antivirus 9

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.33%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.65%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Bullguard* is an old hand at the VB100 by now, with a solid record of entries and passes. The 82MB installer ran along swiftly, with

just a handful of steps for the user to work through and no reboot needed to get protection in place in under a minute. The installation process is enlivened by a rather odd-looking child in a boxing helmet reminding the user that the product is in trial mode.

The design of the *Bullguard* GUI is somewhat unusual, not to say eccentric, with some interesting use of language and some fairly non-standard extras, but it soon becomes clear how to operate things and is actually quite efficient. Default settings are very thorough, including full coverage of our archive sets by default in both modes.

With these thorough settings scanning speeds were slow and overheads were high, as might be expected, especially in the archives set. CPU and RAM usage was likewise fairly heavy.

Detection rates were slightly better than those of *BitDefender*, the supplier of the product's main detection engine, and were thus very solid indeed. No issues emerged in the clean or WildList sets, and *Bullguard* thus earns a VB100 award.

### CA Internet Security Suite Plus 6.0.0.272

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	92.06%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	56.17%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	91.60%	<b>False positives</b>	0

It has become the norm for CA to submit both its consumer and business products for testing. The current home-user

suite was reviewed here in depth recently (see *VB*, March 2010, p.19). The product requires online activation, and was thus installed on the deadline date, allowed to connect for its activation and updates, and then cut off from the web until we were ready to start testing. An initial 144MB installation package was updated online, and the process was reasonably straightforward and speedy.

The interface, as discussed in our recent review, is quite unusual and provides minimal options, but seemed fairly responsive and ran stably throughout the test. Things moved along rapidly, helped by some intelligent caching of results which sped up the 'warm' times considerably, especially in the on-access runs where it is most likely to make a difference. Memory usage was fairly high, although CPU cycles were not overly drained.




Detection rates were much improved on recent tests, with some solid scores in the RAP sets, and with no problems in the WildList or clean sets, the product earns itself another VB100 award.

### CA Threat Manager 8.1.660.0

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	92.06%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	57.19%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	91.64%	<b>False positives</b>	0

CA's business offering is the now quite venerable *Threat Manager*, formerly known as *eTrust* and still bearing the

*eTrust* name in some places. Provided some time ago as an archive of the full CD contents, measuring some 390MB in total, the install process has several stages, including several EULAs which require scrolling through and a section gathering detailed data on the user. CA again requested the product be allowed to activate online, so the product was set



On-demand throughput (MB/s)	Archive files			Binaries and system files			Media and documents			Other file types		
	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files
Agnitum	2.29	18.00	2.29	8.81	391.41	8.81	12.81	76.44	12.81	128.99	343.96	128.99
AhnLab	11.13	11.18	11.13	25.39	25.95	25.39	10.38	10.47	10.38	9.64	9.38	9.64
Alwil	213.25	277.23	7.57	40.49	49.44	37.58	29.03	30.99	29.78	43.00	43.00	24.00
Arcabit	7.02	6.98	7.02	14.86	14.68	14.86	24.14	26.36	24.14	14.95	15.40	14.95
Authentium	5.56	5.61	5.56	12.33	12.26	12.33	18.80	19.60	18.80	11.73	12.14	11.73
Avanquest	0.61	0.61	0.61	4.12	4.60	4.12	1.09	1.53	1.09	2.15	1.56	2.15
AVG	0.68	0.68	0.47	11.74	11.71	2.32	6.82	6.61	6.71	4.98	4.61	4.65
Avira (Personal)	4.34	4.27	4.34	33.55	33.55	33.55	19.43	18.20	19.43	9.64	15.40	9.64
Avira (Professional)	4.09	4.20	4.09	39.80	38.50	39.80	20.66	18.80	20.66	19.84	15.88	19.84
BitDefender	24.98	26.66	24.98	16.37	17.14	16.37	5.45	5.59	5.45	3.45	3.79	3.45
Bkis (Gateway Scan)	99.01	77.01	N/A	3.34	3.34	3.34	4.99	4.90	4.99	4.30	4.06	4.30
Bkis (Home Edition)	99.01	99.01	1.05	3.17	3.17	3.03	4.99	4.93	4.25	4.30	4.11	2.90
Bullguard	4.10	4.09	4.10	26.39	28.90	26.39	11.08	10.42	11.08	8.82	9.38	8.82
CA (ISS)	2.80	2.81	2.80	31.31	29.54	31.31	25.48	25.20	25.48	21.50	20.64	21.50
CA (Threat Manager)	1.27	1386.14	1.27	23.60	117.42	23.60	10.97	55.93	55.93	9.21	33.29	9.21
Central Command	7.81	7.90	2.39	20.69	20.78	20.51	17.50	16.50	12.40	13.76	12.90	10.53
Check Point	1.94	1.95	1.94	16.37	16.25	16.25	6.10	6.27	6.10	6.18	6.45	6.18
Defenx	1.12	14.99	1.12	15.01	391.41	15.01	6.23	22.48	6.23	4.76	51.59	4.76
Digital Defender	3.24	3.24	0.66	10.48	10.63	2.50	13.03	12.26	2.91	12.43	10.32	2.81
eEye Digital Security	1.49	1.50	1.49	1.80	1.77	1.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.59	0.58	0.58
Emsisoft	5.48	5.58	N/A	6.33	6.62	6.33	7.85	8.75	7.85	6.66	7.82	6.66
eScan	126.01	126.01	N/A	3.46	3.46	N/A	0.84	0.84	N/A	0.62	0.62	N/A
ESET	3.62	3.62	3.62	12.90	12.83	12.90	13.33	13.98	13.33	12.58	12.74	12.58
Filseclab	1.24	1.23	1.22	19.99	19.25	19.17	5.73	5.54	5.49	5.32	4.80	5.32
Fortinet	3.90	4.52	3.90	7.26	8.37	7.26	19.94	21.63	19.94	9.38	10.02	9.38
Frisk	7.30	7.33	7.30	11.10	11.32	11.10	26.66	31.41	26.66	18.76	19.47	18.76
F-Secure (Client Security)	6.68	2772.27	6.68	16.77	1565.63	60.22	10.28	114.66	29.40	49.14	343.96	27.15
F-Secure (PSB Workstation)	6.66	2772.27	6.66	361.30	2348.44	64.34	13.49	327.59	36.40	93.81	343.96	28.66
G DATA	2.52	2772.27	2.52	18.06	1174.22	18.06	10.42	229.31	10.42	8.97	343.96	8.97
Ikarus	23.69	23.69	N/A	11.32	11.32	11.32	13.18	12.13	13.18	14.95	10.86	14.95
iolo	6.58	6.60	N/A	11.32	11.24	N/A	14.89	12.07	N/A	8.53	12.43	N/A

(Please refer to text for full product names)

On-demand throughput (MB/s) contd.	Archive files			Binaries and system files			Media and documents			Other file types		
	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files
K7	7.24	7.30	7.24	9.66	9.74	9.66	29.78	29.03	29.78	20.23	19.11	20.23
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 2010)	4.11	1386.14	4.11	30.70	391.41	30.70	16.38	48.79	16.38	11.86	79.38	11.86
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 6)	4.68	1386.14	4.68	37.28	587.11	37.28	11.47	69.49	11.47	13.23	147.41	13.23
Kingsoft (Advanced)	1.55	1.55	1.55	24.46	25.67	24.46	5.49	5.28	5.49	22.93	14.74	22.93
Kingsoft (Standard)	1.52	1.53	1.52	23.02	23.14	23.02	5.32	5.24	5.32	16.64	12.74	16.64
Kingsoft (Swinstar)	5.25	5.21	N/A	37.28	40.14	N/A	32.76	30.17	N/A	25.17	24.57	N/A
Lavasoft	63.01	72.95	N/A	12.17	12.30	12.17	2.46	2.57	2.46	3.50	3.34	3.50
McAfee Total Protection	1.66	2.03	1.66	9.87	50.50	9.87	5.15	15.81	5.15	8.32	36.85	8.32
McAfee VirusScan	86.63	89.43	1.97	13.05	13.08	11.98	7.62	7.10	7.62	6.11	4.37	4.30
Microsoft	2.61	2.52	2.61	13.31	13.27	13.31	19.60	19.60	19.60	10.12	12.14	10.12
Nifty Corp.	2.38	924.09	2.38	17.33	195.70	17.33	6.48	34.23	6.48	6.25	26.46	6.25
Norman	1.12	1.13	1.12	2.47	2.47	2.47	2.33	3.45	2.33	1.59	2.45	1.59
PC Tools (Internet Security)	1.42	1.47	0.51	6.02	25.39	6.02	6.35	6.20	6.35	5.37	5.29	5.37
PC Tools (Spyware Doctor)	2.13	2.22	0.69	31.74	23.48	31.74	8.19	8.25	8.19	7.82	7.48	7.82
Preventon	3.23	3.22	N/A	10.04	10.06	10.04	13.03	12.20	13.03	12.28	10.22	12.28
Proland	7.05	7.04	7.05	19.73	20.16	19.73	7.77	7.67	7.77	5.93	5.49	5.93
Qihoo	1.52	1.52	1.52	5.21	4.99	5.21	1.15	1.03	1.15	0.75	0.84	0.75
Quick Heal	3.57	3.58	2.58	38.50	37.58	38.50	9.93	9.72	9.40	3.75	9.92	8.74
Rising	1.43	1.45	1.43	6.97	7.07	6.97	3.49	3.51	3.49	5.76	5.86	5.76
SGA Corp.	2772.27	2772.27	N/A	24.85	27.15	N/A	15.60	17.24	N/A	85.99	515.94	N/A
Sophos	252.02	277.23	2.48	15.55	15.71	14.45	21.43	23.16	17.11	12.43	11.47	9.05
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Plus)	3.11	3.07	3.11	8.68	9.68	8.68	10.42	9.28	10.42	11.59	6.88	6.88
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Pro)	56.58	53.31	56.58	10.12	10.12	10.12	16.62	17.11	16.62	10.32	10.32	10.32
Sunbelt	102.68	102.68	2.21	13.77	13.73	13.50	2.40	2.39	2.39	3.39	3.12	3.10
Symantec (Endpoint Protection)	2.35	2.24	2.35	14.41	15.71	14.41	8.79	8.92	8.79	6.11	6.22	6.11
Symantec (Norton Antivirus)	4.93	693.07	693.07	29.17	260.94	29.17	13.57	55.93	55.93	13.58	43.00	13.58
Trustport	1.25	1.27	1.25	7.03	7.40	7.03	5.10	4.87	5.10	3.30	3.36	3.30
VirusBuster	7.72	7.77	7.74	20.16	20.25	20.16	15.92	15.29	11.52	79.38	206.38	79.38
Webroot	2.56	2.53	2.56	11.65	11.65	11.65	10.38	9.10	10.38	8.53	5.73	8.53

(Please refer to text for full product names)

up in advance and an image taken on the deadline date after allowing a final update.

The interface is somewhat old-fashioned these days, and in places a little fiddly to use but thanks to our familiarity with its quirks we got through things without any problems. Logging is somewhat tricky, with any large logs overwhelming the viewer system, but deciphering the file format has become second nature after many years and requires just a few judicious sed commands to strip out the oddness and render it into readable text.


Performance measures were similar to the consumer product, with high RAM usage tempered by low CPU impact, while scanning speeds were improved in the warm runs, although not as significantly as in the home-user solution.

Detection figures were also similar to those of the consumer product, with the clean and WildList sets handled immaculately, thus earning *CA* its second VB100 award this month.

### Central Command Vexira Antivirus Professional 6.2.54

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	89.61%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.88%	<b>False positives</b>	0

A new one to this lab team, but not quite to the VB100, *Vexira* last appeared in these pages in June 2006 (see *VB*, June 2006, p.11).



On its return to the test bench, the imposingly named *Central Command* provided its latest product as a 55MB executable with a hefty 118MB update archive, which was added manually in a nice simple way. Running the install required clicking through quite a few steps, but the process ran swiftly, needed no reboot, and was all done in under two minutes.

The interface was immediately familiar when it appeared, being essentially the *VirusBuster* GUI in a different colour scheme. This inspired confidence straight away, and after wrestling briefly with the slightly fiddly layout we soon had things running smoothly.

Things moved very nicely indeed through the speed tests, with some decent on-demand speeds and some feather-light


lag times; similarly light were CPU and RAM usage figures, which barely registered on the scales.

In the final reckoning we observed some pretty good scores all round, with the RAP sets particularly impressive, and with no problems in the clean sets and complete coverage of the WildList, *Vexira* earns itself its first VB100 award, and our congratulations.

### Check Point Zone Alarm Suite 9.1.008.000

<b>ItW</b>	99.99%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.91%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.99%	<b>Trojans</b>	96.80%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	98.91%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Check Point* seems to have adopted a strategy of entering its *Zone Alarm* product to our test on an annual basis – which has paid off, with two passes in the last two *XP* tests.



This time, the suite product was initially thought to need online access to update until a workaround was figured out, and a main product of 120MB was updated with a full set of the latest updates, measuring over 90MB, without problems. The installation process was reasonably simple and quick, with a very fast ‘pre-scan’ and the offer of a ‘browser security’ toolbar included, but did require a reboot to complete.

The interface seemed pretty unchanged from previous entries and perhaps a little old-fashioned, but remained pleasingly simple and clear to operate and offered plenty of configuration options for the more experienced and demanding user. It ran very smoothly and stably throughout the testing and seemed solid and well built.


In the performance tests, neither scanning throughput nor lag times were especially impressive, but drain on processor cycles and memory was not overly substantial, making for a good overall balance.

Detection rates were as excellent as we have come to expect from the *Kaspersky* engine that is included in the product, with especially good scores in the later RAP sets. In the clean sets a few alerts were raised, but as these identified mIRC as an IRC client and RealVNC as a remote access tool, they were pretty accurate and could not be mistaken for false alarms. In the WildList set, all looked pretty clear until it was noted that a single sample of W32/Virut had not been detected, spoiling *Check Point*’s chances of a VB100 award this month and boding ill for several other products based on the same engine.

**Defenx Security Suite 2010 3062.452.0727**

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	89.42%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.88%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Another newcomer, Swiss-based *Defenx* contacted us shortly before the test deadline and was quickly included on the



roster. The product was provided with updates included as an 85MB executable, and ran through a number of set-up stages mainly referring to firewall options, some community participation and training mode settings, with a reboot to finish off and the whole process taking about four minutes. The product itself was recognizable from the moment the GUI appeared, being essentially *Agnitum's Outpost* with a different colour scheme.


This made set-up and use pretty straightforward thanks to our experience with *Outpost*, and the test ran through rapidly and without any problems. On-demand speeds were excellent after initial familiarization with the sets, and on-access lags likewise improved greatly after the first run. RAM usage was a trifle on the high side.

Detection rates were solid, with a generally good showing all around, and with no problems in either the clean or WildList sets, *Defenx* ably earns a VB100 award on its first attempt.

**Digital Defender Antivirus 1.1.67**

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	88.69%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.37%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Yet another newcomer, and another based on the ubiquitous *VirusBuster* engine. *Digital Defender* is a technology partner with



*Preventon*, which took part in the *Windows 7* test a few months ago (see *VB*, December 2009, p.16), and the

products are pretty similar. *Digital Defender* came as a 47MB installer with updates included, had the standard handful of steps to the set-up and was complete in 30 seconds, with no need for a reboot.

The interface is simple and clear, but manages to provide most of the configuration required by all but the most demanding of users. It ran through the tests quickly and stability was solid throughout. On-demand scans were not super fast, but overheads – especially memory use – were low in the extreme, barely registering any impact on the system at all.

Detection rates were pretty decent, with a steady decline across the RAP sets, but this is only to be expected and the clean and WildList sets were handled without difficulty. With no serious problems and much to commend, *Digital Defender* also joins the ranks of the newly VB100 certified this month.


**eEye Digital Security Blink Professional 4.6.0**

<b>ItW</b>	99.99%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	83.47%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.99%	<b>Trojans</b>	76.63%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	94.52%	<b>False positives</b>	3

*Blink* is another fairly regular participant in our comparatives on desktop platforms, and has become quite familiar as a solid and interesting product. The product as provided was a fair size, with a 114MB main installer and an additional 49MB of updates, to cover the numerous component parts included (of which anti-malware protection is just one).

The install process has a fair number of steps, thanks again to the multiple components and the need for an activation key, but doesn't need a reboot to complete and is all done in about three minutes. The interface is fairly clear and simple to navigate, but on-access protection appears not to take effect on-read, and instead tests were run by writing sample files to the system.

Tests proceeded without major incident, although they took some time as on-demand scans were slow, even over the clean set – this is mainly due to the use of the *Norman Sandbox* to thoroughly check unrecognized files. On-access measures look extremely light, but as there was no true on-read protection in place this is an unfair comparison with others in the test; increase in memory usage was still fairly noticeable.



File access lag time (s/MB)	Archive files			Binaries and system files			Media and documents			Other file types		
	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files
Agnitum	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.19	0.04	0.04
AhnLab	0.02	0.02	NA	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09
Alwil	0.03	0.00	0.15	0.04	0.00	0.05	0.11	0.00	0.22	0.19	0.00	0.33
Arcabit	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.05
Authentium	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.19	0.17	0.05	0.22	0.22	0.08
Avanquest	0.01	0.00	NA	0.07	0.01	NA	0.36	0.05	NA	0.27	0.07	NA
AVG	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.19
Avira (Personal)	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06
Avira (Professional)	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
BitDefender	0.01	0.00	0.45	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.14	0.01	0.14	0.18	0.01	0.18
Bkis (Gateway Scan)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.23	0.22	0.23	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.17
Bkis (Home Edition)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.17	0.17	0.17
Bullguard	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.18	0.18	0.18
CA (ISS)	0.01	0.01	0.15	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.22	0.04	0.03	0.33
CA (Threat Manager)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.06
Central Command	0.00	0.00	NA	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.09	0.10
Check Point	0.01	0.01	NA	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
Defenx	0.01	0.00	NA	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.13	0.02	0.13	0.20	0.02	0.20
Digital Defender	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.09
eEye Digital Security	0.00	0.00	NA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Emsisoft	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
eScan	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.06
ESET	0.00	0.00	NA	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05
Filseclab	0.00	0.01	NA	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.01
Fortinet	0.20	0.00	0.20	0.13	0.01	0.13	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.14	0.01	0.14
Frisk	0.01	0.01	NA	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03
F-Secure (Client Security)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.07	0.00	NA	0.15	0.03	NA	0.06	0.03	NA
F-Secure (PSB Workstation)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.07	0.00	NA	0.12	0.00	NA	0.03	0.01	NA
G DATA	0.08	0.00	0.54	0.07	0.00	0.08	0.18	0.02	0.18	0.24	0.02	0.24
Ikarus	0.04	0.04	NA	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07
iolo	0.04	0.04	NA	0.10	0.10	NA	0.16	0.15	NA	0.18	0.17	NA

(Please refer to text for full product names)

File access lag time (s/MB) contd.	Archive files			Binaries and system files			Media and documents			Other file types		
	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files	Default (cold)	Default (warm)	All files
K7	0.02	0.00	NA	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.05
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 2010)	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.13	0.04	0.13	0.14	0.04	0.15
Kaspersky (Anti-Virus 6)	0.01	0.00	0.39	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.13	0.04	0.14	0.14	0.04	0.15
Kingsoft (Advanced)	0.00	0.00	NA	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.05	0.00	0.05
Kingsoft (Standard)	0.00	0.00	NA	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.05	0.00	0.05
Kingsoft (Swinstar)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lavasoft	0.00	0.00	NA	0.07	0.02	NA	0.01	0.00	NA	0.30	0.07	NA
McAfee Total Protection	0.01	0.00	NA	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.13	0.00	0.13	0.21	0.01	0.21
McAfee VirusScan	0.01	0.01	0.44	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.16	0.08	0.15	0.24	0.13	0.23
Microsoft	0.01	0.00	NA	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.08	0.00	0.08
Nifty Corp.	0.01	0.00	NA	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.13	0.02	0.13	0.14	0.02	0.14
Norman	0.01	0.01	NA	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.29	0.28	0.29	0.34	0.34	0.34
PC Tools (Internet Security)	0.01	0.00	NA	0.15	0.01	NA	0.03	0.02	NA	0.03	0.02	NA
PC Tools (Spyware Doctor)	0.01	0.00	NA	0.12	0.04	NA	0.19	0.20	NA	0.25	0.23	NA
Preventon	0.00	0.00	NA	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.09
Proland	0.00	0.00	NA	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.12
Qihoo	0.00	0.01	NA	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04
Quick Heal	0.04	0.04	NA	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Rising	0.02	0.02	NA	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.19	0.15
SGA Corp.	0.00	0.00	NA	0.04	0.00	NA	0.12	0.01	NA	0.02	0.02	NA
Sophos	0.00	0.00	0.34	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.09
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Plus)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.13
SPAMfighter (VIRUSfighter Pro)	0.00	0.00	NA	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
Sunbelt	0.01	0.00	NA	0.06	0.01	0.06	0.38	0.04	0.38	0.27	0.05	0.27
Symantec (Endpoint Protection)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.11
Symantec (Norton Antivirus)	0.01	0.01	NA	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.09
Trustport	0.04	0.01	1.35	0.20	0.02	0.22	0.30	0.09	0.32	0.44	0.06	0.47
VirusBuster	0.00	0.00	NA	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.09	0.09	0.10
Webroot	0.01	0.01	NA	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.17	0.14	0.17


(Please refer to text for full product names)

Detection rates were generally pretty decent, but in the WildList set imperfect coverage of the latest W32/Virut strain was evident, with the sandbox improving things somewhat on-demand. In the clean sets there were also a handful of samples misidentified as malware, and so *Blink* is denied a VB100 award this month.

### Emsisoft a-squared Anti-Malware 5.0.0.31

<b>ItW</b>	99.95%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	78.59%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	N/A	<b>Trojans</b>	98.29%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.81%	<b>False positives</b>	1

Yet another new arrival, and one which has been anticipated for some time thanks to an excellent reputation for high detection rates, *Emsisoft's a-squared* incorporates the *Ikarus* engine along with some improvements of its own. The installer package is a 75MB executable, and online updating was insisted on by the vendor. The install process took only a few moments, but it took a while longer to get things up and running thanks to the online activation and updating process.



Once installed, we found the product very attractive, with a crisp and colourful GUI adorned with a delightful rotating golden Trojan horse. There appeared to be a decent range of configuration options provided, in a pleasant and accessible manner. On investigating further, however, we found that the on-access component was unresponsive to various stimuli; this remained the case despite various efforts – restarting the module and the test systems, installing afresh and so on. The version of the product in use, with full on-read protection included, is at an early stage of beta, so such problems are to be expected, but we were disappointed not to be able to test the product fully. A quick investigation of more recent releases – produced a week or two after the test deadline – showed that the issues had been resolved and a much more rugged, stable on-access component was being provided even to beta users.


Without the on-access component there seemed to be little point running the full range of performance tests, but the on-demand scan times were fairly middle-of-the-road. Running through the detection tests, we had some further issues as the product seems to maintain all detection data in memory until a scan is complete, rather than writing out to a log as it goes, so on attempting large scans with lots of data to store it had a tendency to collapse under

the pressure. Fortunately, a command-line scanner is also provided, and this proved much more stable. With some data finally in, some truly superb results were observed, with all sets completely demolished, the RAPs especially looking set for a top-of-the-table score. Sadly, in the WildList set a batch of Virut samples were not detected – which would have been enough to deny *Emsisoft* a VB100 award even had its on-access component been fully operational – and a single false alert in the clean sets also denies it the chance to take up a prime position on our aggregate RAP charts. Despite these teething problems, we expect to see *a-squared* becoming a force to be reckoned with in the near future.

### eScan Internet Security for Windows 10.0.1058.653

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.29%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.65%	<b>False positives</b>	0

From a newcomer to one of our most regular entrants; *eScan* has been a fixture in our comparatives for many years, and has gone from strength to strength in recent tests. The latest version comes as a fairly large 112MB executable, with a rather long and drawn-out installation process involving numerous prompts and dialogs.



The GUI is very nicely designed and unfussy, providing a decent level of configuration, although some options are notable by their absence – such as the choice to scan inside archive files to a greater level than the rather scanty defaults. At times the product was rather slow to respond to clicks, especially when accessing on-demand scan browse windows, and some of the on-demand speed scans took rather a while to get through. File access lag times were not insanely heavy though, and memory usage remained fairly low until serious activity was demanded of the product.

In the detection test, however, scores were exemplary, with excellent rates in most sets and a reliably high level across the reactive part of the RAP sets. With nothing missed in the WildList and nothing of note in the clean sets other than a few warnings of corrupted files, *eScan* comfortably wins yet another VB100 award.

Archive scanning		ACE	CAB	EXE-ZIP	JAR	LZH	RAR	TGZ	ZIP	EXT*
Agnitum Outpost Security Suite Pro	OD	2	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X/√	X/√	X/√	X	X/√	X	X/√	√
AhnLab V3 Internet Security	OD	X	√	X	X	√	√	X	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Alwil avast! free antivirus	OD	X/√	X/√	√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√
	OA	X/√	X/√	√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	√
Arcabit ArcaVir 2010	OD	2	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X/2	X/5	√/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	√
Authentium Command Anti-Malware	OD	5	5	5	5	√	5	2	5	√
	OA	X/4	X/4	X/4	X/4	X/√	X/4	X/2	X/4	X/√
Avanquest Double Anti-Spy Professional	OD	X	X	√	√	X	√	X	√	√
	OA	X	X	√	X	X	X	X	X	X
AVG Internet Security Network Edition	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	X/√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X/√
Avira AntiVir Personal	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	√
Avira AntiVir Professional	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	√
BitDefender Antivirus 2010	OD	√	√	8	√	√	√	8	√	√
	OA	X/√	X/√	X/√	2/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	1/√	√
Bkav Bkav Gateway Scan	OD	X	X	X/1	X/1	X	X/1	X	X/1	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Bkav Bkav Home Edition	OD	X	X	X/1	X/1	X	X/1	X	X/1	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Bullguard Antivirus	OD	√	√	8	√	√	√	8	√	√
	OA	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
CA Internet Security Suite Plus	OD	X	9	9	X	9	9	9	X	√
	OA	X	X	X	1	X	X	X	1	√
CA Threat Manager	OD	X	√	X	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	1	X	X	X	1	√
Central Command Vexira Antivirus Professional	OD	2	√	√	X/√	X	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X/√
Check Point Zone Alarm Suite	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Defenx Security Suite 2010	OD	2	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Digital Defender Antivirus	OD	1	1	1	1	X	1	X	1	√
	OA	1	1	X	X	X	1	X	1	X/√
eEye Digital Security Blink Professional	OD	X	4/√	1	4/√	4/√	4/√	2/√	4/√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√

Key: X - Archive not scanned; X/√ - Default settings/thorough settings; √ - Archives scanned to depth of 10 or more levels; [1-9] - Archives scanned to limited depth; EXT\* - Eicar test file with random extension; All others - detection of Eicar test file embedded in archive nested up to 10 levels.

Archive scanning contd.		ACE	CAB	EXE-ZIP	JAR	LZH	RAR	TGZ	ZIP	EXT*
Emsisoft a-squared Anti-Malware	OD	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	√
	OA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
eScan Internet Security for Windows	OD	X	X	8	X	√	X	X	X	√
	OA	X/1	X/√	X	X/√	X	X/√	X/1	X/√	√
ESET NOD32 Antivirus	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	5	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Filseclab Twister Anti-TrojanVirus	OD	5/√	3/√	3/√	4/√	1	4/√	X	5/√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	1	X	2	X
Fortinet FortiClient	OD	X	√	√	√	√	√	√	4	√
	OA	X	9	√	√	√	√	√	4	√
Frisk F-PROT	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	2	2	X	X	X	2	√
F-Secure Client Security	OD	X/√	√	√	√	√	√	8	√	X/√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
F-Secure PSB Workstation Security	OD	X/√	√	√	√	√	√	8	√	X/√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
GDATA Antivirus 2010	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	√	√	4/√	√	√	√	8/√	8/√	√
Ikarus virus.utilities	OD	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	√
	OA	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	√
iolo System Mechanic Professional	OD	X	X	5	X	X	X	X	5	X
	OA	X	X	5	X	X	X	X	5	X
K7 Total Security	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	1	X
Kaspersky Anti-Virus 2010	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X/4	X/4	1	X/4	X/4	X/5	X/1	X/2	√
Kaspersky Anti-Virus 6 for Windows Workstations	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	√
Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Advanced Edition	OD	X	√	X	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Standard Edition	OD	X	√	X	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Swinstar Edition	OD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lavasoft Ad-Aware Professional Internet Security	OD	X	X	√	X	X	1	X	1	√
	OA	X	X	√	X	X	X	X	X	X
McAfee Total Protection	OD	2	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
McAfee VirusScan Enterprise	OD	X/2	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	√
	OA	X/2	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	X/√	√

Key: X - Archive not scanned; X/√ - Default settings/thorough settings; √ - Archives scanned to depth of 10 or more levels; [1-9] - Archives scanned to limited depth; EXT\* - Eicar test file with random extension; All others - detection of Eicar test file embedded in archive nested up to 10 levels.


Archive scanning contd.		ACE	CAB	EXE-ZIP	JAR	LZH	RAR	TGZ	ZIP	EXT*
Microsoft Security Essentials	OD	√	√	√	2	2	2	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	1	X	X	X	X	1	√
Nifty Corp. Security 24	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	1	X	X	X	X	X	√
Norman Security Suite	OD	X	√	1	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
PC Tools Internet Security 2010	OD	2	√	√	√	X	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	√	X	X	X	X	X	X
PC Tools Spyware Doctor	OD	2	√	√	√	X	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	√	X	X	X	X	X	X
Preventon Antivirus	OD	1	1	1	1	X	1	X	1	√
	OA	1	1	X	X	X	1	X	1	X/√
Proland Protector Plus Professional	OD	2	√	√	√	X	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X/√
Qihoo 360 Security	OD	√	√	8	√	√	√	8	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X/√
Quick Heal AntiVirus 2010	OD	X/2	X/5	X	2/5	X	2/5	X/1	2/5	X/√
	OA	2	X	X	1	X	X	X	1	X/√
Rising Internet Security 2010	OD	X	X	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X	X	√	X	X	X	X	X	√
SGA Corp. SGA-VC	OD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sophos Endpoint Security and Control	OD	X	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/√
	OA	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/5	X/√
SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Plus	OD	1	1	1	1	X	1	X	1	√
	OA	X/1	X/1	X	X	X	X/1	X	X/1	X/√
SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Pro	OD	X	4	4	4	X	4	√	5	√
	OA	X	X	2	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sunbelt VIPRE AntiVirus Premium	OD	X	X	√	X/√	X	X/√	X	X/√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Symantec Endpoint Protection	OD	3/√	3/√	3/√	3/√	3/√	3/√	1/5	3/√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Symantec Norton Antivirus	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	5	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
Trustport Antivirus 2010	OD	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	OA	X/√	X/√	X/√	√	X/√	X/√	X/√	1/√	√
VirusBuster Professional	OD	2	√	√	X/√	X	√	√	√	X/√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X/√
Webroot AntiVirus with SpySweeper	OD	X	√	5	5	√	√	5	√	√
	OA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	√

Key: X - Archive not scanned; X/√ - Default settings/thorough settings; √ - Archives scanned to depth of 10 or more levels; [1-9] - Archives scanned to limited depth; EXT\* - Eicar test file with random extension; All others - detection of Eicar test file embedded in archive nested up to 10 levels.

**ESET NOD32 Antivirus 4.2.35.0**

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	98.55%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.55%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*ESET* is another VB100 stalwart, with an unrivalled record of clean sheets. The product is provided as a pre-updated executable of



just 37MB, and the installation process remains pretty much unchanged from many previous experiences. With just a handful of stages to get through, including the unusual step of forcing the user to make a choice on whether to detect 'potentially unwanted' software or not (presumably allowing the product greater freedom to detect certain types of nasty without threat of reprisals), the process is all done within under a minute and a half, with no need to reboot.

The interface and configuration screens are as solid, slick and stylish as ever, and everything has an air of quality about it. The only issue we observed was a lack of clarity in the more advanced and unusual on-access controls, where what seemed to be options to allow archives to be scanned appeared not to function as intended – but this could have been a misunderstanding on our part of the purpose of the controls in question.

Running through the tests in short order, scanning speeds were solid and dependable, while on-access lag times were excellent, with RAM and CPU usage both at the lower end of the scale.


In the infected sets detection rates were splendid, with another excellent showing in the RAP sets, and with yet another test untroubled by WildList misses or false alarms, *ESET* further extends its remarkable unbroken run of VB100 awards.

**Filseclab Twister Anti-TrojanVirus 11.68.65389**

<b>ItW</b>	97.97%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	41.20%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	97.91%	<b>Trojans</b>	84.10%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	93.97%	<b>False positives</b>	5

*Filseclab* has become a pretty regular competitor in our comparatives in the last couple of years, continuing to enter

gamely despite not yet having achieved VB100 certification. The product arrived as a 52MB download direct from the public website, with the updater from the same source at 14MB. The set-up runs through in a few steps, and although an error message pops up at the end, all seems to have completed properly.




The interface is busy and bustling with controls, options and modules. The on-access protection seems a little unusual, kicking in shortly after file reads – thus alerting on malicious activity, but not necessarily blocking the reading or writing of malicious files. As such, the measures taken in our performance tests – which show minimal memory usage and file access lag times – may not be entirely comparable with other products under test this month. On-demand scans were a little on the slow side.

Detection rates were pretty decent – a little lower than desirable in the polymorphic set but with some very solid scores in the RAP sets. The WildList set was covered fairly well, with a few samples missed and imperfect coverage of the latest Virut strain. With a handful of false positives in the clean sets *Filseclab* still has a little way to go before earning that precious first VB100 award.

**Fortinet FortiClient 4.1.2.138**

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.09%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	73.80%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	93.58%	<b>False positives</b>	1

*Fortinet's FortiClient* arrives as a minute 8MB package, but with a nice big 134MB updater accompanying it. The installation process is fast and easy – just a handful of clicks, a licence key and no reboot required to round things off, followed by a simple manual updating process. The product interface is cleanly designed and well laid out, easy to navigate with an excellent depth of configuration as befits its business credentials.



Scanning times were not super fast, and on-access overheads initially fairly hefty, although much improved on subsequent runs. Memory drain was fairly notable, with CPU usage more middle-of-the-road.

Product	RAM use increase – idle system	RAM use increase – heavy file access	CPU use increase – heavy file access
Agnitum Outpost	6.52%	8.56%	14.93%
AhnLab V3	5.36%	5.62%	25.08%
Alwil avast!	13.25%	14.64%	30.41%
Arcabit ArcaVir	10.50%	11.05%	21.63%
Authentium Command	7.13%	6.86%	35.14%
Avanquest Double A-S	16.89%	22.08%	21.86%
AVG I.S.	10.58%	14.17%	28.05%
Avira AntiVir Personal	2.44%	3.51%	15.52%
Avira AntiVir Pro	5.56%	4.39%	20.14%
BitDefender Antivirus 2010	4.71%	7.59%	24.06%
Bkis Bkav Gateway	5.21%	5.93%	33.65%
Bkis Bkav Home	3.73%	3.46%	33.88%
Bullguard Antivirus	23.26%	24.70%	31.64%
CA I.S.S. Plus	20.04%	19.65%	15.08%
CA Threat Manager	20.05%	17.10%	15.99%
Central Command Vexira	3.22%	2.78%	21.85%
Check Point Zone Alarm	7.11%	9.21%	18.42%
Defenx Security Suite	12.27%	13.19%	17.76%
Digital Defender	7.40%	6.22%	24.38%
eEye Digital Security Blink	13.70%	12.28%	12.47%
Emsisoft a-squared	N/A	N/A	N/A
eScan I.S.	4.05%	9.57%	11.54%
ESET NOD32	5.70%	6.53%	20.73%
Filseclab Twister	7.48%	7.02%	22.76%
Fortinet FortiClient	16.59%	19.22%	19.61%
Frisk F-PROT	7.32%	7.11%	27.28%
F-Secure Client Security	7.42%	9.31%	17.17%
F-Secure PSB	9.44%	8.15%	17.00%
G DATA 2010	8.43%	8.46%	27.23%
Ikarus virus.utilities	10.74%	7.90%	27.56%
iolo System Mechanic	17.41%	16.56%	28.19%


Product	RAM use increase – idle system	RAM use increase – heavy file access	CPU use increase – heavy file access
K7 Total Security	8.50%	6.85%	20.51%
Kaspersky 2010	8.60%	10.25%	13.44%
Kaspersky Anti-Virus 6	8.52%	9.79%	12.38%
Kingsoft I.S. 2010 Advanced	7.60%	6.64%	16.94%
Kingsoft I.S. 2010 Standard	13.12%	10.25%	15.61%
Kingsoft I.S. 2010 Swinstar	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lavasoft Ad-Aware	8.80%	11.49%	18.21%
McAfee Total Protection	4.62%	7.75%	16.64%
McAfee VirusScan	5.57%	8.05%	17.81%
Microsoft Security Essentials	6.05%	7.01%	17.28%
Nifty Corp. Security 24	7.07%	9.60%	20.41%
Norman Security Suite	8.11%	14.52%	30.26%
PC Tools I.S. 2010	11.85%	9.96%	14.43%
PC Tools Spyware Doctor	8.73%	12.05%	31.48%
Preventon Antivirus	8.97%	7.05%	23.66%
Proland Protector Plus	10.26%	10.64%	13.47%
Qihoo 360 Security	3.41%	5.95%	10.38%
Quick Heal 2010	11.74%	14.61%	27.63%
Rising I.S. 2010	3.95%	6.61%	28.52%
SGA Corp. SGA-VC	13.23%	13.09%	17.55%
Sophos Endpoint	8.69%	7.24%	25.42%
SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Plus	6.63%	5.97%	23.71%
SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Pro	6.93%	6.64%	16.02%
Sunbelt VIPRE	6.47%	9.91%	26.01%
Symantec Endpoint Protection	12.78%	14.45%	11.03%
Symantec Norton	16.65%	11.22%	20.96%
Trustport 2010	12.91%	18.05%	22.06%
VirusBuster Professional	3.76%	3.11%	22.27%
Webroot SpySweeper	7.90%	14.23%	23.37%

Detection rates seemed generally improved over recent tests, with some especially notable increases in the RAP scores once again. The WildList was covered without difficulty, but in the clean sets a single item was alerted on with a generic detection – enough to upset *Fortinet's* chances of a VB100 award this month.

### Frisk F-PROT 6.0.9.3

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	83.12%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	96.40%	<b>False positives</b>	1

*Frisk's F-PROT* is available as a trial on the company's public website, with the initial download an MSI file of a mere 26MB. It runs through the standard set of steps in just a few moments, all done in just 30 seconds or so with no reboot required. The definitions file is somewhat larger, at 47MB, and is simply dropped in place manually to complete the set-up process.



The interface hasn't changed in a long time, with its simple clean lines and basic configuration settings, and it operates easily and responds well. Running through our tests, we saw some reasonable scanning speeds and not overly intrusive overheads. In the infected sets, a number of error messages hinted at problems with the product, but scans seemed to complete without issues and the on-access protection remained solid.

With tests complete and results in, we saw some pretty decent scores in the main sets, with RAP scores declining steadily across the weeks. The WildList was handled well, but in the clean set the same *Adobe Reader* file that caused problems for *Authentium* was mislabelled, thus denying *Frisk* a VB100 award this month.

### F-Secure Client Security 9.00 build 851

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	95.50%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.65%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*F-Secure* once again entered two products for this comparative, with the main client solution provided as a 57MB installer with an updater of 83MB. The install is fairly lengthy, with a number of steps and some notable pauses in between various stages; at the end a reboot is required, with the whole process taking several minutes.

After the first reboot, the interface insisted it was still installing, and the on-access component appeared not to have turned

on, but we assumed this was due to the absence of web connectivity, and after a second reboot all seemed fine.

The performance tests were worked through without incident, with some slowish times on the first run but pretty startling improvements in the warm scans. Both memory and CPU usage were pretty low throughout.

We had noted in recent tests some stability issues with the displaying of lengthy log files, but these seem to have been resolved and data was all obtained without difficulty. In the detection tests, the standard sets were covered excellently, while the RAP scores started very high but dropped steadily towards the later weeks. The core certification sets were handled cleanly, and a VB100 award is comfortably earned.



### F-Secure PSB Workstation Security 9.00 b149

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	95.50%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.65%	<b>False positives</b>	0

The second of *F-Secure's* entries is presumably more business-oriented, but looks and feels pretty identical to the *Client Security*

solution. The initial installer is slightly larger at 69MB, with the same updater used, and the set-up process was much the same. The design and layout of the interface is likewise pretty similar; a clean and cool look with simple, minimalist controls and options.

Scanning speeds were also along the same lines as the previous entry, improving remarkably on the second and subsequent runs through the sets, and fairly light on RAM and processor cycles. With the same set of definitions, scores were essentially the same throughout with, as



expected, no problems in the WildList or clean sets. A second VB100 award goes to *F-Secure* this month.

### G DATA Antivirus 2010 20.2.4.1

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	99.91%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.92%	<b>False positives</b>	0


*G DATA's* muscular 272MB installer package runs through nine or so separate stages with lots of questions and interaction,

requiring a reboot at the end, but the process is complete in only two minutes or so.

The interface is attractively designed with some lovely clean lines, and good simple access to all areas of controls. An excellent level of detail is provided for all types of configuration, making the product suitable for the most demanding power user as well as the more trusting novice.

With the fairly thorough default settings, scanning speeds and access times were fairly slow and sluggish, but sped up excellently on subsequent repeat runs, while memory usage was impressively low for a dual-engine product.


Those dual engines really come into play in the detection tests, where truly superb detection levels were attained across the sets, with even the later weeks of the RAP sets handled well. With no issues in the WildList or clean sets, *G DATA* easily earns another VB100 award.



### Ikarus virus.utilities 1.0.182

<b>ItW</b>	99.95%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	78.59%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.95%	<b>Trojans</b>	98.80%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.94%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Ikarus* put in an excellent performance in the RAP sets on the last occasion it entered, and we were looking forward to more of the same after the good showing of the *Emsisoft* solution (which uses the *Ikarus* engine). The product is supplied as an ISO image of the installer CD, at 195MB all told, with an updater of 54MB. The set-up runs



through in numerous stages, including the installing of the *Microsoft .NET* framework, making for a somewhat lengthy process, but no reboot is needed at the end.


The interface is still rather simplistic and a little wobbly at times, but it provides some basic configuration options. Running scans is also a bit confusing, with little information provided as to the progress of scans. However, they did complete in the end and all the required data was acquired.

Scanning speeds were a little slow, and on-access overheads were not super light, but RAM and CPU usage was not excessive. In the detection tests, as expected the trojans and RAP sets were demolished completely, with truly heroic scores in just about every subsection, while false positives were remarkable for their absence. Sadly, in the WildList set a smattering of samples of the latest W32/Virut strain were not detected, denying *Ikarus* a VB100 award despite an excellent performance in general.

### iolo System Mechanic Professional 9.56

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.85%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	83.23%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	96.38%	<b>False positives</b>	1

It has been a few years since *iolo's* first few entries in the VB100, and it was good to see it back on board. The company's current flagship product, *System Mechanic*, is widely sold in high street outlets and has had some great reviews for its clean-up and optimization components.



The product was provided as a 64MB installer, requiring Internet connection to update, so it was set up on the deadline day and an image of the test machine taken for later testing. The installation process is rather lengthy, including numerous prompts related to the many components, and required a reboot to complete. The interface is very professional looking, running stably and responsively throughout our tests despite some seriously intense pressure. Little configuration is provided for the anti-malware component, with so many other modules to cover in a single GUI, but the defaults are sensible and it all seems to work nicely.


In the speed tests, on-demand scans were not the fastest, with some fairly notable slowing down in the file access times and a sizeable chunk of memory used up. Although the logs were difficult to convert from a rather odd format into more usable text, we got results in the end and detection was found to be generally pretty good throughout,

declining fairly sharply across the RAP sets. Comparing these numbers with others already recorded and perusing the titles of the installation folders gave away the secret of the provider of the core anti-malware components: *Authentium*. Unfortunately, this meant the same false positive which upset *Authentium*'s chances came into play again here, and *iolo* doesn't quite meet the VB100 requirements this month. However, a solid performance hints at much better things to come.

### K7 Total Security 10.0.00.29

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	96.09%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	98.91%	<b>False positives</b>	0

K7 has become a regular fixture in our tests over the last few years, steadily building a solid reputation and considerable respect from the lab team



for simple, solid performances. The install of the current version arrives as a 52.2MB executable and runs lightning-fast, completing in the blink of an eye with just three clicks from the user; no reboot is required.


The interface is colourful and attractive, and laid out clearly and simply. A good level of configuration is made available to fine-tune the behaviour of the product in most respects. Running through all the tests, the product proved stable and reliable despite the heavy stresses, and the on-demand scanning speeds were on the good side of average. On-access lag times were respectable to start with and improved greatly on re-runs, with RAM and CPU footprints also good.

Moving on to the detection tests, some splendid scores were achieved in the standard sets and the earlier RAP sets, with a fairly steep decline into the freshest and proactive sample sets. With only a single suspicious alert in the clean set, and no problems handling the WildList, K7 adds to its tally of VB100 awards with another fine performance.

### Kaspersky Anti-Virus 2010 9.0.0.736

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.84%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.12%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Kaspersky* also entered two products for this month's test, with the company's retail home-user solution up first. This is



supplied as a 68MB executable, with updates provided as an archived copy of the online databases (the archive measuring a hefty 360MB). The installation process runs through several stages, including a request for a licence code. Although licence files were supplied, there was no obvious way to load them in, and the product seemed averse to accepting any codes typed in, so we proceeded with a trial version only. No restart was required to get protection in place.

The green-and-red-heavy interface is big on clarity, with large fonts and simple phrasing making for simple and error-free navigation. Beneath the novice-friendly veneer, configuration is provided in enough depth to satisfy the most demanding of power users. This made running through the tests something of a breeze, with scanning speeds only average at first but benefiting hugely from some intelligent caching on subsequent runs. On-access overheads were similarly unobtrusive, while memory usage was perhaps a little above average but CPU cycle impact fairly low.


In the infected sets, detection rates came in even better than we had expected, with excellent figures across all sets. A remarkable steadiness in the reactive portion of the RAP sets supports the company's reputation for rapid reaction to newly emerging threats. Despite our worries after seeing issues with other products using the *Kaspersky* technology, no problems were encountered in the WildList, and with the clean sets also handled well *Kaspersky* solidly earns another VB100 award.

### Kaspersky Anti-Virus 6 for Windows Workstations 6.0.4.1212

<b>ItW</b>	99.99%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.99%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.99%	<b>Trojans</b>	95.39%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	98.56%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Kaspersky*'s second entry is, we assume, a more corporate-focused one, provided as a 62MB installer package, with the same batch of files also used to update from. Again the install process runs through numerous stages, many related to the firewall components, and a reboot is required, with further configuration on restart.

The interface is pretty similar to the 2010 edition in most respects, with good clarity and excellent configuration options. Speed and performance measures closely mirrored the home-user product, while detection rates were slightly lower in most sets but still achieved a generally excellent level, especially in the RAP sets.




The clean sets were handled without issues, but in the WildList set the same single sample of Virut which caused problems earlier went undetected – hinting that the 2010 edition uses some advanced detection skills not included in version 6. *Kaspersky Anti-Virus 6* is thus denied a VB100 award this month by a whisker.

### Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Advanced Edition 2008.11.6.63

ItW	100.00%	Polymorphic	56.61%
ItW (o/a)	100.00%	Trojans	11.02%
Worms & bots	80.40%	False positives	0

Kingsoft submitted a trio of products for the test in something of a hurry as the deadline clashed with the new year holidays in



China. The *Advanced* edition was provided as a 46MB executable with updates included, and installed simply in just a handful of steps, completing in 30 seconds or so and not requiring a reboot.


The interface is unchanged from several previous tests – simple and clear with a good level of controls provided, and it seemed stable and responsive throughout testing. Scanning speeds were unexciting, and lag times a little above medium but showing signs of improvement on re-running. Memory use and CPU impact were on the better side of average, though.

In the infected sets, scores were generally pretty feeble, with some real problems in the trojans sets and RAP scores starting low and heading downwards sharply. The WildList was handled adequately though, and with no problems in the clean sets *Kingsoft's Advanced* product meets the requirements for a VB100 award.

### Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Standard Edition 2008.11.6.63

ItW	100.00%	Polymorphic	56.61%
ItW (o/a)	100.00%	Trojans	20.93%
Worms & bots	81.84%	False positives	0

The *Standard* edition of *Kingsoft's* product is nearly indistinguishable from the *Advanced* one in most respects, with an identical install process



and interface. Scanning speeds were also remarkably similar, but memory usage was notably higher.


Also higher were detection rates in the trojans and RAP sets, suggesting that the hurried submission had perhaps led to some errors in the updating of the *Advanced* edition; while still not great, the improvements take the scores out of the disastrous zone into the merely weak.

However, the WildList was again covered cleanly, and with the clean sets also handled without problems *Kingsoft* wins a second VB100 award for its *Standard* edition.



### Kingsoft Internet Security 2010 Swinstar Edition 2010.01.13.06

ItW	99.17%	Polymorphic	47.72%
ItW (o/a)	N/A	Trojans	43.99%
Worms & bots	87.18%	False positives	1

*Kingsoft's* third entry, labelled 'Swinstar', is apparently a bleeding-edge preview of the company's upcoming technology, as hinted at by the version numbers. The miniature 29MB installer takes only two clicks to run through and is done in seconds; no reboot is needed.



The redesigned interface remains simple, gaining perhaps a little glitz and glamour but still seem fairly easy to use, with a decent level of configuration. Not all of the options provided seemed fully functional however, as despite all our efforts we could not persuade the on-access component to respond at all, even to execution of malicious files. Even more bizarrely, the Eicar test file was not detected even



in the apparently functional on-demand mode. Thus, our archive depth and performance measures were rendered useless; on-demand scanning speeds were recorded, and proved to be somewhat quicker than the previous editions, putting them on the better side of average.

Detection rates were also notably improved, although still not reaching the heights of decent. A handful of W32/Virut samples were missed in the WildList set, compounding the absence of on-access protection to prevent *Kingsoft*'s third entry this month from earning a VB100 award.

### Lavasoftware Ad-Aware Professional Internet Security 8.2.0


<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	65.16%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.72%	<b>Trojans</b>	99.10%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.71%	<b>False positives</b>	2

This month, *Lavasoftware*'s renowned *Ad-Aware* makes its long-awaited debut in our VB100 tests. After being impressed by the product in a standalone review some time ago (see *VB*, September 2008, p.14), we've been waiting for on-read detection to be enabled before it could be pushed

through our tests, and were excited to see it finally arrive on the test bench. The installer was a fairly sizeable 151MB, and ran through in not too many steps, one of which was the offer of a toolbar, taking a minute or so in total and needing a reboot to finish off. After restarting, the system seemed to take some time to come to.

The interface is fairly simplistic, with access to controls a little confusing and, when found, not very detailed. Nevertheless, running through the standard performance tests was not a problem, with some fairly good throughput times and pretty light on-access overheads – although memory usage was perhaps a little on the high side.

In the infected sets things were a little less straightforward. Initial runs through the test sets failed numerous times, with the scans – and on occasion the entire system – coming to a grinding halt. Part of the cause of this seemed to be the approach to scanning, which insists on storing all detection data in memory and not writing anything out to logs until after actions have been applied to detected items. This meant that after running scans over large-ish infected sets – which took a few hours even on trimmed down portions of the standard test sets – we had to wait for the disinfection and removal process to complete before any data could be gathered. As this could take up to ten times as long as the scan itself, it left much more



opportunity for problems to emerge, and as the memory usage built steadily, errors cropped up regularly – at one point the main process tried to absorb 2GB of memory before collapsing under its own weight. Similar problems emerged during the on-access tests too, but eventually, by splitting the sets into smaller and smaller chunks and re-running tests until they ran through to completion, we managed to gather some usable figures. Of course, this kind of scenario would be unlikely (although not impossible) in the real world, but we do expect products to be fairly resilient when under pressure.

In the final reckoning, some pretty decent detection scores were achieved, especially in the RAP sets, with the numbers as well as the stability issues hinting at a change of engine provider since we last looked at the product. In the WildList however, a pair of items were not picked up on access, thanks to a fairly common file extension being missed from the list of types to scan by default. A couple of false positives in the clean sets confirmed that *Lavasoftware* would not qualify for a VB100 award this month.


### McAfee Total Protection 10.0.570



<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.99%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	95.91%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.40%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Back to another regular, *McAfee* products having taken part in VB100s since the dawn of time. The company

has recently started submitting its consumer product lines as well as its corporate offerings, and these have caused us a few minor difficulties thanks to the apparent absence of any facility for installing or updating without web access, but having made special provisions for such products this was less of a hassle than usual this month. The original installer downloaded from the company's website measures only 2.8MB, and when run pulls the remainder of the product down, with over 100MB coming through in the initial run; the process is fairly simple and idiot-proof, taking at most a few minutes to get everything done with no reboot needed at the end.

The interface of this version is slightly different from the others we've looked at lately, and seems to buck the trend towards colourfulness and curvy lines in consumer





products. This one is grey, bleak and boxy, rather bewildering to navigate, at times slow to respond and provides minimal configuration options, but behind the brittle exterior it seems to run smoothly and solidly with not a whisper of stability problems.

On-demand scans were good and fast, while file access lags were a little slower than some, and memory and CPU usage seemed light. The infected test sets were handled excellently, with some good scores in the RAP sets too, and with no problems in the WildList or clean sets *McAfee* takes away another VB100 award without difficulty.

### McAfee VirusScan Enterprise 8.7.0i


<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.99%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	93.35%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.11%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Total Protection's corporate big brother, *VirusScan*, is much more flexible, as befits a serious business environment,

and comes as a zip bundle of 84MB with an automated updater program of 120MB. The install process features numerous steps split into several stages, and is presented stolidly and chunkily throughout. On completion, a reboot is not demanded, but is recommended as it is required for the loading of one of the network drivers.

Like the previous product, the interface takes a grey and angular theme, but somehow it seems much more reassuring here. This is solid, respectable and unpretentious business software, providing what's needed without fuss, and it seems to do it well; configuration is provided in minute detail and everything seems sensible and logical – very much approved of by the lab team.

Scanning speeds were average, and on-access lag times fairly hefty, but with minimal RAM and CPU impact. Running through the main test sets proved no problem, with detection rates a trifle lower than the home-user scores, probably thanks to the several hours difference between grabbing the offline updater package and finally completing the online install for the other product. The WildList was covered in its entirety however, and with no issues in the clean sets either, *McAfee* adds further to its VB100 haul.



### Microsoft Security Essentials 1.0.1611.0

<b>ItW</b>	99.99%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.99%	<b>Trojans</b>	95.41%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.42%	<b>False positives</b>	0


*Microsoft's* much lauded free-for-all desktop product seems to be doing good business and making some impression on the overall malware problem. A major update was recently made available, but didn't quite make the cut for this month's test.

The product is usually installed online, but for our purposes an offline installer and updater were made available, measuring 60MB and 52MB respectively, which ran through swiftly in a handful of simple steps. No reboot was needed to finalize the process, and we were swiftly up and running.

The interface is simple and straightforward, neither overly fancy nor unsettlingly strait-laced; it provides some degree of configuration, but generally encourages users to stick to the (fairly sensible) pre-ordained defaults. Logging was a little strange for our purposes, but we eventually worked out how to process the details and got some usable results.

On-demand throughput was on the decent side, with file access lag times not bad to start with and barely perceptible once the product had settled into the system. The new performance measures showed a fair amount of RAM and CPU usage.



In the detection sets, coverage was generally excellent, with some very respectable scores in all sets. The clean sets caused no problems, but in the WildList set a single sample of the large batch of W32/Virut replications was not detected, showing a minor flaw in coverage of this strain – enough to deny *Microsoft* a VB100 award this month.



### Nifty Corp. Security 24 5.6

<b>ItW</b>	99.99%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.99%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.99%	<b>Trojans</b>	94.31%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	98.62%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Nifty*, the Japanese firm whose product is based on the *Kaspersky* detection engine, returns to our test bench this month to challenge us with its unusually designed, untranslated interface. Provided as a 163MB zip containing all components including updates, the install process runs through only a handful of steps, not all of them displaying properly even with basic Japanese character support



included. Installation completes in under a minute before insisting on a reboot to finish things off.

Once installed, and guided by some instructions from the developers where characters were not properly displayed, we soon found our way around those bits of the GUI we needed access to, but detailed configuration was a little beyond the scope of our investigations. The defaults seemed fairly sensible though, and speed tests ran through nicely, with some good use of caching technology to speed things up over multiple runs. The memory usage also seemed fairly low.



Detection rates were generally excellent, as expected of the *Kaspersky* engine, with a couple of perfectly justified suspicious alerts in the clean sets. In the WildList set, as feared, a single Virut sample was not detected, and thus *Nifty* is denied a VB100 award this month despite an otherwise strong performance.

### Norman Security Suite 7.3

<b>ItW</b>	99.99%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	82.92%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	99.99%	<b>Trojans</b>	76.42%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	94.48%	<b>False positives</b>	3

*Norman's* flagship suite has been rejigged lately and received some approving glances from the lab team in the last *Windows* comparative. The current product comes as a 65MB installer, including all updates, and runs through in half a dozen steps which include firewall details and information on the experience level of the user. At the end, a message indicates that a reboot may be required shortly, and sure enough after another minute or so it does indeed ask the user to restart the system.

The interface is browser-based and looks competent and serious. It is fairly easy to navigate and provides a basic selection of configuration options, but in some areas it seemed a little baffling – having gone to the trouble of setting up some on-demand scan jobs using the task editor utility, there appeared to be no way to fire them off. We could have missed something of course, but being in something of a hurry we resorted to using the context-menu scanner instead. One other eccentricity about the product is the provision of a screensaver scanner, which runs when the computer is not in use.



Ploughing through the speed tests took some time, in part thanks to the sandbox system which carefully checked out unknown files in the clean sets; this would have benefited from some caching of previous results to speed things up on re-runs. Both memory and CPU cycle usage seemed rather higher than most.

Detection rates were not bad though; there was a fair showing in the trojan and RAP sets, with a steady decline in the more recent weeks. In the WildList, a selection of Virut samples were missed – rather more on access than on demand thanks to the sandbox catching a few more – and a handful of false positives were raised in the clean sets, one of which was yet another version of the *Adobe Reader* installer. *Norman* thus does not reach the required grade for VB100 certification this month.

### PC Tools Internet Security 2010 7.0.0.514

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.95%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.51%	<b>False positives</b>	0


*PC Tools* has shown some solid improvements since its acquisition by *Symantec*, and with two products submitted as

usual we looked forward to a continuation of this trend. The top-of-the-line *Internet Security* product comes as a chunky 117MB installer, which runs through quickly, with just five dialogs to respond to and a run time of under 30 seconds on a fast system.

Once up and running, the interface is slick and attractive, still not very instinctive to operate but providing a fair selection of configuration options after a little exploration. Running on-demand scans was a little frustrating thanks to a long delay opening the browse window each time, but we eventually got to the end and gathered some results.

These showed some slowish scan times but feather-light impact on file accesses. Memory use was a little on the high side but CPU use tended toward the lower end, making for what seems an overall well-balanced performance.

Detection rates again showed major improvements over previous months; the reactive parts of the RAP sets were covered superbly, although a significant drop was observed in the samples gathered after the product deadline. With no



issues in the clean or WildList sets, *PC Tools* comfortably earns another VB100 award.

### PC Tools Spyware Doctor 7.0.0.538

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.93%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.51%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Spyware Doctor* contains most of the same components as the *Internet Security* suite product, bar the firewall, and the set-up


process, run from a 109MB install package with all updates preloaded, zips through in the same sort of time – one major difference being the offer of a *Google* toolbar. The navigation process was eased slightly by having already explored the suite solution and we stormed through the tests, finding some pretty similar results as expected, but a few minor differences too.

The on-demand scanning speeds were notably faster, while the access lags were considerably heavier; RAM usage balanced out as much the same, with slightly less used while idle but more when under heavy strain. Use of CPU cycles also seemed heavier. Detection rates were very similar to those of the previous product, and with matching results in the clean and WildList sets, another VB100 award is comfortably earned by *PC Tools*.

### Preventon AntiVirus 4.1.67

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	88.69%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.37%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Preventon* made a successful debut in the recent *Windows 7* test and looked likely to repeat its success again this month, given the results already obtained for other products



using the same technology. The 48MB installer took half a dozen clicks and under 30 seconds to get its business done, and didn't need a reboot to put the machine under its protective sway.

The interface is simple and unfussy but manages to provide a decent set of options. Running through the tests was something of a breeze therefore, and glancing through the results showed the expected fairly zippy scanning speeds, fairly light lag times and slightly higher use of CPU and RAM.

Detection results were also much as expected, with solid coverage in the standard sets and a decent level in the RAP sets, declining steadily across the weeks. The WildList and clean set posed no difficulties, and *Preventon* keeps up its record of VB100 passes to make it two out of two.

### Proland Protector Plus Professional 9.1.003



<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	88.94%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.84%	<b>False positives</b>	0


The *Proland* name is something of a blast from the past, the company having entered products in several tests in the late 1990s, and again in

a few scattered comparatives in more recent years – so far without much success. Its return took the form of a fairly normal 48MB installer, which ran through in six steps in under 30 seconds, with no reboot.

The interface is clear and lucid, with some attractive use of colour but no attempt to overdo the styling; it provides a decent level of basic configuration, with sensible defaults, and seems to respond well to the user even under pressure. Scanning speeds were fairly good, with a light touch in terms of file access lags but a fair amount of memory being used, while detection rates were generally solid with a decent starting level in the RAP sets.

For those experiencing déjà vu here, fear not; the merest glance at the scores quickly confirms that this is yet another implementation of a hugely popular engine for OEM retailers. The WildList and clean sets were handled ably, and *Proland* takes home a VB100 award.






### Qihoo 360 Security 1.1.0.1096

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.98%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.01%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.55%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Qihoo* first appeared on the VB100 radar in the Windows 7 test late last year, with some success; the Chinese product uses the



*BitDefender* engine, and this month also offered full English translation, for our testing pleasure. The installer is no more than 77MB complete with updates, runs though in under 30 seconds with just a handful of clicks, proudly featuring a VB100 logo on one of the dialogs, and no reboot is needed.


The interface is pretty clear and simple, with the new translations helping us a lot; it seems nicely laid out, easy to navigate and responsive. On-access behaviour is a little eccentric, claiming in its configuration to block access to infected files on-read, whereas in fact access appears to be allowed, with warning pop-ups appearing shortly afterwards (or quite some time later if, like us, you bombard the solution with detections and the pop-ups have to queue up for the user's attention). Nevertheless, logs were kept of detections and results calculated from those.

The non-standard approach to on-access protection may have resulted in some less than accurate performance records, which seem to show an extremely light impact on the system; on-demand scans, by contrast, were rather slow. Detection rates were hard to fault however, with some splendid scores across the sets. With no problems in the WildList or clean sets *Qihoo* earns its second VB100 award in a row.

### Quick Heal AntiVirus 2010 11.0.4.0.0.2

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	99.51%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	83.47%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	96.34%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Back among the VB100 veterans, it's a rare test that doesn't feature a *Quick Heal* product, and its appearance is usually welcomed



thanks to a strong reputation for straightforward, reliable and zippy behaviour. The current version came in at 88MB, and again installed very rapidly with just a few dialog prompts, completing with no reboot required in under a minute, including the brief 'pre-scan' run to check for dangerously infected systems.

The interface has been given a fresh lick of paint for the new decade but remains much the same in layout and design; simple, elegant and efficient, it manages to provide a solid level of configuration without over-cluttering itself.


Scanning speeds were perhaps not quite as fast as we're used to, with impact on system resources slightly heavier than expected too; detection rates were decent though, with a respectable level achieved across the sets. The WildList and clean sets presented no difficulties, and *Quick Heal* earns yet another VB100 award.

### Rising Internet Security 2010 22.00.02.96

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	70.02%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	54.05%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	87.94%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Despite being a long familiar name in the industry, *Rising* has a surprisingly short history in the VB100, with a good showing in 2008 followed by fewer entries and less luck in 2009. The company's 2010 product, provided as a 74MB

installer, started slowly with a rather lengthy set-up process, multiple dialogs to respond to and a reboot required.



Running through the tests was helped by a slick and attractive interface that also managed to pack in plenty of configuration without hampering easy navigation; the dancing lion in the corner of the screen was perhaps less useful. Speed tests seemed to pass without incident, recording some sluggish on-demand times and some hefty lags on access, although RAM usage was impressively low.

The detection tests were a rockier ride, with excitement aplenty; the heavy strain of the test sets did some odd things to the system, including some nasty mangling of the window manager which took some time to recover from. The on-access scanner appeared to shut down on occasion too; it was not clear whether this was caused by a particularly problematic file or by general exhaustion from the strain, but most of the main sets were managed without too much difficulty and the trojans set was eventually run to completion thanks to hard work, numerous small runs and removal of any files which seemed to be causing difficulties. On-demand scans ran a little more smoothly, although there was still a hefty impact on the system, and the logs produced at the end were pretty awkward for a human to interpret (a button is provided in the GUI to export them, but this seemed permanently greyed out).

Eventually we had all the information we needed in a usable form, and it showed some respectable figures in some sets, with the RAP scores perhaps a little disappointing and the trojan set scores hampered by the issues getting complete scans to run. The WildList was handled impeccably though, and without issue in the clean sets *Rising* scrapes its way to another VB100 award, tempered with hopes that these issues are resolved as soon as possible.

### SGA Corp. SGA-VC 2

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	96.92%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.49%	<b>False positives</b>	0

While the name *SGA-VC* may not ring many bells with our readers, veteran followers of the VB100 will doubtless recall *VirusChaser*, which had a long and proud history in our comparatives until a few years ago. Returning after a lengthy absence, both the product and the company have

undergone something of a revamp, with the vendor now known as *SGA Corporation* and its product referred to generally as *VC*, although

the full '*VirusChaser*' title does crop up here and there. Internally, the core detection technology is now apparently provided by *BitDefender*.

The product was supplied to us as a 79MB installer with the updates rolled in, which took just half a dozen clicks and less than a minute to get up and running, with no reboot required. Translation seemed only partially complete, with much of the EULA presented in characters which couldn't be properly rendered by an English version of *Windows*. Another integration issue presented itself on the first run, when the *Windows Firewall* warned that it had blocked the scanner's activities – presumably an initial update attempt.


The main interface seemed straightforward enough though – a little cluttered and text-heavy but with the main components displayed clearly. Configuration proved a little minimal, with very little available that we needed; it was entirely impossible, for example, to persuade the product to scan anything other than its default extension list, while the archive option is present but seemed to have no effect. There was also some confusion over the whitelisting mode: a sample was accidentally marked 'always ignore' and there was no clear way of undoing this.

Nevertheless, we soon got through all our jobs, and found some usable results after untangling the product's logs. With the light default settings scanning speeds were pretty fast and lag times low, while resource usage was very low indeed. Detection rates, on the other hand, were very high, with great scores across the board – in many cases notably higher than those of *BitDefender* itself, presumably due to some adjustments to the engine's sensitive heuristics or some additional detection technology provided by *SGA*.

The WildList and clean sets caused no problems, and *SGA* comfortably returns *VirusChaser* to the ranks of VB100 certified products.

### Sophos Endpoint Security and Control 9.0.3

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	95.32%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.14%	<b>False positives</b>	0




*Sophos*'s latest product range has a rather ungainly title, but after a spell of leaning towards a scattered modularity seems now to

have gently absorbed the multiple additional components that have been thrown in, rather than having them bolted on top or hovering awkwardly alongside. The version provided for the test weighed in at a lightish 66MB, with an additional 13MB of updates, and the installer was fairly fast and simple after a brief pause at the beginning.

With things quickly up and running, and the interface still its same no-frills self – with easy access to the main components and some quite absurdly detailed configuration just a few clicks away – tests sped swiftly along. Scanning speeds were pretty good, while lag times were no more than medium, and resource usage leaned towards the better side of average.


Detection figures were solid and assured, with some excellent scores in the RAP sets, and stability was generally solid. At one point – perhaps trusting too much in the product's reliable reputation – we took a shortcut and kicked off an overnight run of the main sets while an on-access test of the same sets was still running. On our return the next day we found an error message and a crash dump, but the incident did not seem to have affected either test, both of which had finished happily and produced excellent results. With the WildList and clean sets causing no problems, *Sophos* romps to another VB100 award.



### SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Plus 6.100.3

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	88.50%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.36%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Yet another new face, *SPAMfighter* first considered a VB100 entry some years ago, at which time the product was using *Norman*'s detection engine. Now a member of our elite band of VBSpam certified vendors, the company joins the VB100 tests too, with a pair of entries.



The 'Plus' version was provided ready for action as a 46MB executable. There were few prompts to get through before the installation process kicked off, but it took a full five minutes, with no reboot, to complete. The design is simple and novice-friendly, colourful and full of encouraging language as well as details of the firm's other products. A handful of the more vital configuration options are provided, but little else besides.

Performance measures showed some slow-ish scan times and heavy-ish lags, but RAM and CPU usage was fairly respectable; detection rates were quite solid with a steady downward curve in the RAP sets, and the figures revealed yet another entry for this month's most popular engine by some considerable distance. The WildList and clean sets were, unsurprisingly, handled immaculately, and *SPAMfighter* also joins the growing ranks of VB100-certified vendors.


### SPAMfighter VIRUSfighter Pro 6.2.68

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	88.69%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.37%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*SPAMfighter's* second product seems to be a slight step down in class from the first, although there is little obvious difference to the naked

eye. This one was not prepared in advance and required online installation and updating, but this was a fairly simple process, no more difficult or time-consuming than the offline experience of the *Plus* version. The interface looks identical, and we hoped for a similarly smooth run through the tests, but soon discovered there would be some impediment to this.

While the *Plus* version had been set simply to block access and log detections, this version insists on attempting to disinfect or quarantine every item it detects. As we have seen from other products in the past, this approach can make large tests rather slow and difficult. Eventually, as the test period drew to a close, we were able to allocate the product four of our test systems for a whole weekend, and with each of them running a section of the main tests we finally got some results in only four-and-a-bit days, or 16.5 machine/days (given our original estimate of one machine/day per product to complete the test on time, this




was rather generous of us, but we were keen to ensure the test reached a nice round number of participants).

With these issues aside (which are fairly minor, unlikely to affect the majority of users, and due to be fixed with an additional button in an upcoming build), all went pretty smoothly, with scanning speeds slightly faster and file access lag times slightly slower than the *Plus* edition. Resource usage was pretty identical, as were detection rates across the sets. Again no problems cropped up in the core sets, and *SPAMfighter* takes away a second VB100 award this month.

### Sunbelt VIPRE AntiVirus Premium 4.0.3248

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	65.19%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	N/A	<b>Trojans</b>	98.98%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.71%	<b>False positives</b>	2

Another of those gaining their first VB100 award in the recent *Windows 7* comparative and back hoping for more of the same, *Sunbelt* provided its latest product as a 16MB installer with a 55MB update package. The install itself was fast and easy with just a handful of prompts including a licence code request, and was done in around 30 seconds, at which point a reboot was required. From the installer title, it was clear that this product was in a late beta stage.



The design of the interface remains simple and fairly clear. Most options are not deeply configurable but some controls at least are provided; some areas seemed to have changed rather subtly from previous versions, and it was not entirely clear if it would be possible to disable the automatic quarantining of detected items, which had been necessary in the last test.

The performance tests ran through fairly smoothly but not super fast, with some slowish scan times and fairly hefty lag on access – much improved on repeat attempts it should be noted. Resource usage measures were about average for the group tested.


Detection scores on demand were splendid, with a particularly strong showing in the RAP sets. This was something of a surprise after a less-than-stellar performance here last time around. The WildList was handled with aplomb in this mode, but on access things did not go well: when faced with even the smallest handful of infected samples in a short period of time the product suffered serious errors, often rendering the whole system

barely responsive. Eventually, after several attempts on numerous systems with identical results, we were forced to abandon attempts to gather on-access scores completely. To add insult to injury, a couple of false positives were picked up in the clean sets, thus sealing *Sunbelt*'s fate for this month.

### Symantec Endpoint Protection 11.0.5002.333

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	97.26%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.26%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Once again we return to one of our regulars, with *Symantec*'s corporate edition back in the test. The product is routinely



sent in the form of an archive containing a full set of contents from the install CD, so the submission measures over 500MB but includes numerous components not required here; the offline updater came in at 62MB. The set-up process is a little lengthy, mainly thanks to the other options available in the package, with some stately language to accompany the pace, but it's all done within a few minutes and rounds itself off with a reboot which, we are imperiously informed, we may delay one time only.

The *Symantec* product is pretty familiar to us by now, with a soft and curvy main GUI concealing the much more business-like configuration controls buried within. These provide for excellent depth of adjustment, and are generally logically designed and easily navigated.


Performance tests showed both scan times and file access lags on the less exciting side of medium, with resource consumption also tending more towards the heavy than the light, but stability was rock-solid throughout.

Detection rates were generally excellent in most of the sets, with a fairly steep drop in the RAP sets from lofty heights in the reactive portions to much lower figures in the proactive week, reflecting *Symantec*'s focus on a dynamic and reputation-based protection system which we are not currently in a position to exercise properly. With the WildList covered without a blemish however, and no problems in the clean set either, *Symantec* has no problems achieving the required standard for yet another VB100 award.

### Symantec Norton Antivirus 17.5.0.127

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	96.69%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.59%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Symantec*'s home-user brand *Norton* is pretty much ubiquitous around the world and one of the most widely used security



solutions. *Symantec* has in the past tended to focus on submitting its corporate products for VB100 testing, but has finally been persuaded to submit the retail editions as well. The 84MB main installer runs through in moments, and uses the same updater tool as the corporate product; we gave it a reboot just to make sure the updates had fully kicked in.

The interface took a few moments 'initializing', but when it appeared generally impressed with the slick and stylish design and a surprising depth of configuration and options. Running through the tests proved no problem, with the clear logging a special bonus for us. On-demand scanning speeds were pretty decent, and much improved on second and subsequent runs too, and while the product's lag times were a tad lighter than those of its corporate cousin, use of RAM and CPU cycles was perhaps a smidgen higher.


In detection results, the scores were slightly higher across the board – presumably with some heuristics set slightly higher by default, so again excellent numbers are seen in most sets, bar the proactive week of the RAPS. The core certification sets presented no problems, and *Norton* is also a worthy winner of a VB100 award.

### Trustport Antivirus 2010 5.0.0.4092

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	99.81%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.94%	<b>False positives</b>	0

*Trustport* has been doing pretty well in our tests lately, having settled into a twin-engine approach which seems to suit it nicely. The latest build was sent in as a 151MB executable, and ran through in a fairly large number of stages but not taking too much time. On completion no true central GUI is provided, but rather a cluster of control and configuration screens, of which the central control module

is the closest to a main interface. After a few moments figuring out where everything is this proves a pretty usable method of control, with just about everything one could want within reasonably easy reach.




Performance figures were not the best, as one would expect from a dual-engine product, with some slow scanning times, heavy use of system resources and long lags accessing files, but this is made up for as usual by superb detection rates. All three reactive weeks of the RAP sets were treated with disdain, and even the proactive week presented few difficulties.

The WildList set was demolished just as easily, and with no false alarms in the clean sets *Trustport* walks away with another VB100 award.

### VirusBuster Professional 6.2.51

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	89.11%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	89.61%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	97.88%	<b>False positives</b>	0

At last we get round to the progenitor of the engine which seems to have been behind half the products in this month's test. Having




looked at both its detection and performance scores already this month, and even its interface in different colours, there seems little more to say, other than that it installed quickly and easily, has a slightly overcomplicated GUI, ran swift and light, got pretty decent scores across the sets, and had no problems achieving a VB100 award. Well done to *VirusBuster*, as well as to its many partners.

### Webroot AntiVirus with SpySweeper 6.1.0143

<b>ItW</b>	100.00%	<b>Polymorphic</b>	100.00%
<b>ItW (o/a)</b>	100.00%	<b>Trojans</b>	95.92%
<b>Worms &amp; bots</b>	99.30%	<b>False positives</b>	0

Finally we reach the last product on this month's list; *Webroot's* latest incarnation comes as a 41MB installer and a 63MB updater

package, which installs pretty swiftly, with the offer of a toolbar and only two further prompts until a reboot is demanded.



The interface remains reasonably usable if a little cluttered in places, with some of the configuration seemingly deliberately concealed in the shrubbery. The performance tests showed rather slow scanning speeds, heavy file access lag times and sizeable resource consumption. These impressions were confirmed in the infected sets, where the product's greenish, yellowish hues and angular shapes make the user feel like they are pushing a boxcar full of angry cows through a custard lake.

As scans progressed the system gradually wound itself into a pitiful state, with windows taking longer and longer to refresh. Eventually the first scan reached its end, and the button marked 'deselect all' was followed, through lack of any alternative, by that marked 'quarantine selected'; this confused matters even further and ended up hanging the system entirely, requiring a forced restart.

Of course, most users would be unlikely to find themselves in such a situation, and after nursing the product in a similar fashion through the rest of our tests, and finding no problems in the WildList or clean sets, and some excellent detection rates elsewhere, *Webroot* is deemed worthy of the last of this month's record crop of VB100 awards.

## CONCLUSIONS

First, if you have made it this far, congratulations – it has been a long haul for us, and now you have joined us on our epic journey through the highs and lows of the current anti-malware market. With such a huge selection of products there are of course many notable trends and developments to comment on, but with so much already said I'll limit myself to the most vital and obvious.

The first thing that springs to mind looking over these results is the continuing trend for the relicensing of engines by OEM product makers, and the gradual climb to dominance of certain players in these markets. Of the 60 products in this month's test, nine were underpinned by the same engine, while another engine provided the

technology for four and another for three more. This trend presents some interesting points as we look to move our testing towards more labour- and time-intensive real-world methodologies, where the number of products that can be tested will be limited by the available resources. It seems vital that we continue to provide VB100 testing for this wealth of products, to ensure the public have a trustworthy source of information on their performance levels, but it also seems that the level of detail currently included could be trimmed somewhat, to allow us to carry out other duties.

A lot of the burden this month has been imposed by difficult and recalcitrant products. *Windows XP* is a mature and common platform, so we assume that products will support it solidly and without difficulty. However, this month's test has seen quite scandalous levels of instability, crashing, hanging, errors and shutdowns, failure to bear up under even the slightest strain and, in two separate cases, complete failure to provide any on-access protection at all. In this day and age users expect and deserve better; many of the companies here this month would do well to give their QA processes a thorough overhaul before doing anything else.

Of course, there have also been the usual problems with failure to detect WildList samples and with false positives in the clean set. This month's haul of FPs has included some fairly glaring examples, including several versions of *Adobe's Reader* – one of the most common pieces of non-*Microsoft* software on the planet – as well as samples from *Microsoft* itself and other major providers including *Google* and *Sun*. In the race to expand detection by ever more aggressive heuristics, vendors must strive to balance their detections with the false alarm rate, and in some cases this balance is not quite being maintained.

In the WildList, the deadly Virut once again took its casualties. These complex polymorphic viruses are proving challenging for labs to detect fully and accurately – which is exactly as their makers intended. Hopefully with our help and encouragement we can make a contribution to improving things on this score – all vendors with issues should already have been provided with samples and information, and we will continue to work with them to ensure any problems are fully rectified.

And now our work here is almost done. We look forward to a rather quieter comparative next time around.

#### Technical details:

All performance tests were run on identical systems with *AMD Athlon64 X2* Dual Core 5200+ processors, 2GB RAM, dual 80GB and 400GB hard drives, running *Microsoft Windows XP Professional, Service Pack 3*. Some additional tests were run on secondary systems with *AMD Phenom X2* Dual Core 550 processors, 4GB RAM, dual 40GB and 1TB hard drives, also running *Microsoft Windows XP Professional, Service Pack 3*.

## APPENDIX – TESTING METHODOLOGY AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The testing methods of the VB100 are provided in some detail on our website (<http://www.virusbtn.com/vb100/about/100procedure.xml>), but as we have made a few additions to the data we provide in recent months it seems appropriate to provide an overview of how we go about testing products and gathering information on them, as well as how the figures and graphs we provide are intended to be used.

### VB100: WildList and clean set

The VB100 certification scheme rests on two main areas of testing: the WildList set of malicious samples – verified as active malware commonly seen infecting the systems of real-world users – and our clean sets. The clean sets consist of our speed sets – compiled by harvesting all files from a selection of machines and organizing them by file type – plus a large set of known-good files from a broad selection of sources including magazine cover CDs, popular download sites, pre-installed OEM machines, hardware manufacturers' driver and update sites and others. We try to ensure that the test set is reasonably representative of the real world without penalizing products for what might be considered minor infractions, unlikely to inconvenience most users. We endeavour to select samples of files that are likely to have a significant user base, excluding more obscure and uncommon packages. We also try to exclude packages that make use of unsavoury activities such as harvesting user data without adequate permission, and also avoid most security-related software, in particular anti-malware software.

Currently, the process of assigning a significance value to non-malicious software is more of an art than a science. While the user-base of some types of software can be divined from download statistics on popular freeware sites, such data is not freely available for all types of file. Likewise, measuring the impact on the user of a false positive is not trivial. We have been investigating various methods of classifying files on both these scales for some time, and with some work being done by the AMTSO group on exactly these issues, we hope to be able to introduce a more clearly documented selection process for our clean sets in the near future.

The WildList test set is compiled on much more rigid grounds; each item on the monthly lists produced by the *WildList Organization* is represented by a single control sample, carefully vetted and confirmed by the list's operators, and each of these control samples is separately validated and replicated by our own lab staff. In most cases the malware replicates either on or off the local system, producing a file that is identical to the control sample. In such cases the

replicated file alone is used as our representative sample. However, in some cases, multiple file extensions may be used by a single item (for example, filling a shared folder with several copies of the same file, but using various different filenames intended to lure people into opening them, with different extensions used to conceal the files' purpose and potential). In such cases several copies of the sample are added to our test set, including each extension it is seen using. Additional files – such as dropped or downloaded files or loader files required to launch a control sample – are not included in the core set. In the case of file infectors, the original control sample is used to create replicants, infecting a range of 'goat' files; for polymorphic samples, this is done many times, with a limit of 2,500 representative samples of any given virus strain included in the official set; the original control sample is not used. When completed, the set should contain only samples which can cause an infection exactly as the control samples would cause.

The WildList is due for some updating to include a wider range of sample types very soon. When this expansion comes into play, we expect to adjust our replication process to focus simply on validation, as most samples in any such list will have no internal replication mechanisms; we also expect the list to provide an even tougher challenge to product developers than it already does.

The VB100 certification requirements demand that products detect the entire WildList set, both on demand and on access, without generating any false positives in the clean set. A certified product is simply one which has met these requirements; it does not imply that the product is superb if it has passed a single certification run, or that it is useless if it has failed to meet the requirements in a single run. On its own, a single VB100 pass can only show that a product is legitimate and competently put together; that its makers know what they are doing and have good access to the most common samples likely to affect their users. For a more complete picture of the quality of a product, our readers need to look at several reviews and monitor the performance of products over time to get an idea of the consistency and reliability of a solution. For this reason, we provide detailed archive data of all our tests on our website, along with summary information on each product's performance history (see <http://www.virusbtn.com/vb100/archive/>).

### Additional data

To support this insight into quality as well as competence, each comparative review provides a range of information to complement the basics of the certification scheme. These extras include detection rates over our polymorphic, worms and bots, and trojans test sets and products' RAP scores. The RAP scores are based on detection rates for four sets of samples compiled over the three weeks prior to a test

deadline and one week after product submission, thus giving an idea of products' reactive and proactive detection abilities. The samples used in the RAP sets come from our daily feeds from various sources including malware labs from around the world and other independent collections, and exclude adware and 'potentially unwanted' items. They also currently exclude true viruses due to time constraints in performing proper replication of such samples. As part of the set-building process, we try to classify samples and select those with the greatest prevalence. This classification is currently based on our prevalence data, which is compiled from reports provided by a number of bodies including several major security firms as well as independent groups and government organizations.

Most of our main test sets are performed both on demand and on access. The on-demand tests for all our sets are run where possible as a standard scan from the product interface. Where the interface does not provide the option of scanning a single folder, a context-menu ('right-click') scan is substituted. This scan is performed with the default settings; the only adjustments made are to ensure that full and detailed logging is kept, and where possible to disable the automatic cleaning, deletion or quarantining of detected items. For on-access tests, an opener tool is run over the set performing simple file-open actions, and taking the MD5 checksum of the file if permitted to access it. For products which do not check files on-read, files are copied from one drive of the machine, or from a remote system, to the system partition to measure on-write detection. Again, default settings are used as far as possible, with logging and auto-cleaning the only areas adjusted. The RAP and main clean sets are generally only scanned on demand, under the assumption that, in general, on-demand scanners use more thorough defaults than on-access ones and any detection or false alarms made on access would also appear on demand. When products cannot be made to produce adequate logs on demand, or otherwise fail to satisfy our requirements in this way, on-access runs over these sets may be substituted.

The same methods are applied to the performance tests, most of which are run from DOS batch scripts which control the file-accessing tools and performance monitors used to gather information for our charts and graphs.

Of course, all of this only scratches the surface as far as modern security solutions are concerned, with a wide range of technologies remaining untouched by these methodologies. We continue to investigate ways of expanding our testing to include a full range of techniques including live online resources and dynamic monitoring. However, we have no doubt that simplified tests of core functionality such as provided here – covering a wide range of solutions and a broad depth of threats – will continue to be useful to ensure the legitimate can be discerned from the devious, the rogues from those of good pedigree.