

# SELabs

## INTELLIGENCE-LED TESTING

### Endpoint Security

# Small Business

Jan - Mar 2024

**EPS**  
PROTECTION





SE LABS ® tested a variety of anti-malware (aka ‘anti-virus’; aka ‘endpoint security’) products from a range of well-known vendors in an effort to judge which were the most effective.

Each product was exposed to the same threats, which were a mixture of targeted attacks using well-established techniques and public email and web-based threats that were found to be live on the internet at the time of the test.

The results indicate how effectively the products were at detecting and/or protecting against those threats in real time.



Management

Chief Executive Officer Simon Edwards  
Chief Operations Officer Marc Briggs  
Chief Human Resources Officer Magdalena Jurenko  
Chief Technical Officer Stefan Dumitrascu

Testing Team

Nikki Albesa  
Thomas Bean  
Solandra Brewster  
Jarred Earlington  
Gia Gorbald  
Anila Johny  
Erica Marotta  
Luca Menegazzo  
Jeremiah Morgan  
Julian Owusu-Abrokwa  
Joseph Pike  
Georgios Sakatzidis  
Dimitrios Tsarouchas  
Stephen Withey

Publication and Marketing

Colin Mackleworth  
Sara Claridge  
Janice Sheridan

IT Support

Danny King-Smith  
Chris Short

Website [selabs.uk](https://selabs.uk)  
Email [info@SELabs.uk](mailto:info@SELabs.uk)  
LinkedIn [www.linkedin.com/company/se-labs/](https://www.linkedin.com/company/se-labs/)  
Blog [blog.selabs.uk](https://blog.selabs.uk)  
Post SE Labs Ltd,  
55A High Street, Wimbledon, SW19 5BA, UK

SE Labs® is ISO/IEC 27001 : 2013 certified and  
BS EN ISO 9001 : 2015 certified for The Provision  
of IT Security Product Testing.

SE Labs is a member of the Microsoft Virus Initiative (MVI);  
the Anti-Malware Testing Standards Organization (AMTSO);  
the Association of anti Virus Asia Researchers (AVAR);  
and NetSecOPEN.



© 2024 SE LABS LTD

Contents

Introduction 04

Executive Summary 05

1. Total Accuracy Ratings 06

Small Business Endpoint Security Awards 07

2. Threat Responses 08

3. Protection Ratings 10

4. Protection Scores 12

5. Protection Details 13

6. Legitimate Software Ratings 14

6.1 Interaction Ratings 15

6.2 Prevalence Ratings 16

6.3 Accuracy Ratings 16

6.4 Distribution of Impact Categories 17

7. Conclusions 17

Appendices 18

Appendix A: Terms Used 18

Appendix B: FAQs 18

Appendix C: Product Versions 19

Appendix D: Attack Types 20

Document version 1.0 Written 18th April 2024



## Introduction

# Lift your org's security into the top 1%

## Back to security basics

It's a shocking statistic, but most businesses don't have a cyber security plan. Given the lack of general interest in cyber security, it's no wonder that ransomware and less obvious threats are running riot through computer systems all over the world.

The larger the organisation, the more complex its security needs, but at the very core the same old cliched advice still applies to everyone:

- 1. Back up your important data.**
- 2. Use multi-factor authentication.**
- 3. Use endpoint protection.**
- 4. Apply security patches when available.**

If that sounds painfully basic and boring, I'm sorry. But it's still the best advice out there. You don't need AI, blockchain or other magical concepts to raise yourself to the top 1% of secure internet users.

If you want to know which endpoint protection to use, this report will help you or your business choose. There is, of course, more to cyber security than choosing an 'anti-virus' program though!

How you manage the products is important. Can you push out policies quickly and comprehensively? What happens when a

license expires (or a product incorrectly determines that its license has expired)? What kind of impact does the software have to the performance of its host?

This report focuses on the effectiveness of endpoint security but SE Labs continues to build its insight into other aspects of endpoint security. It does this through hands-on experience with security products and through the business community. If you want to know more, please [get in touch](#).

SE Labs is a big supporter of a holistic and back-to-basics approach to security. For that reason, it supports The-C2, a new business-focussed cyber security conference. In March this year Chief Information Security Officers (CISOs), analysts and other security experts from around the world gathered in London for the exclusive The-C2 conference, covering 'the basics' and much more.

You can see the programme and other details of the event at [The-C2.com](#).

If you don't have a cyber security plan (a statistical likelihood) start with this report then join our community to learn more about securing your organisation. To register your interest please email [janice@the-c2.com](mailto:janice@the-c2.com).

# Executive Summary

## Product Names

It is good practice to stay up to date with the latest version of your chosen endpoint security product. We made best efforts to ensure that each product tested was the very latest version running with the most recent updates to give the best possible outcome.

For specific build numbers, see **Appendix C: Product Versions** on page 19.

| Executive Summary                          |                                |                                |                           |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Products Tested                            | Protection Accuracy Rating (%) | Legitimate Accuracy Rating (%) | Total Accuracy Rating (%) |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 100%                           | 100%                           | 100%                      |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 100%                           | 100%                           | 100%                      |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 100%                           | 100%                           | 100%                      |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 99%                            | 100%                           | 100%                      |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 81%                            | 99%                            | 92%                       |

Products highlighted in green were the most accurate, scoring 85 per cent or more for Total Accuracy. Those in yellow scored less than 85 but 75 or more. Products shown in red scored less than 75 per cent.

For exact percentages, see **1. Total Accuracy Ratings** on page 6.

● **The endpoints were generally effective at handling general threats from cyber criminals ...**

Most products were very capable of handling public email- and web-based threats such as those used by criminals to attack Windows PCs, tricking users into running malicious files or running scripts that download and run malicious files. However, one product was not completely effective.

● **... but targeted attacks caused problems for some of the products.**

Four of the five products provided complete protection against the targeted attacks used in this test. One product missed 14 targeted attacks, a concerning result since it only takes one targeted attack to breach an organisation.

● **Which products were the most effective?**

Products from **Kaspersky**, **Microsoft** and **ESET** produced extremely good results due to a combination of their ability to block malicious URLs, handle exploits and correctly classify legitimate applications and websites. These products, together with the product from **Sophos**, were awarded with an AAA rating. **Webroot's** endpoint product performed well enough to achieve an AA award.

# 1. Total Accuracy Ratings

Judging the effectiveness of an endpoint security product is a subtle art, and many factors are at play when assessing how well it performs. To make things easier we've combined all the different results from this report into one easy-to-understand graph.


The graph below takes into account not only each product's ability to detect and protect against threats, but also its handling of non-malicious objects such as web addresses (URLs) and applications.

Not all protections, or detections for that matter, are equal. A product might completely block a URL, which stops the threat before it can even start its intended series of malicious events. Alternatively, the product might allow a web-based exploit to execute but prevent it from downloading any further code to the target. In another case, malware might run on the target for a short while before its behaviour is detected and its code is deleted or moved to a safe 'quarantine' area for future analysis. We take these outcomes into account when attributing points that form final ratings.

For example, a product that completely blocks a threat is rated more highly than one that allows a threat to run for a while before eventually evicting it. Products that allow all malware infections, or that block popular legitimate applications, are penalised heavily.

Categorising how a product handles legitimate objects is complex, and you can find out how we do it in **6. Legitimate Software Ratings** on page 14.

| Total Accuracy Ratings                     |                       |                    |       |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Product                                    | Total Accuracy Rating | Total Accuracy (%) | Award |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 1,140                 | 100%               | AAA   |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 1,140                 | 100%               | AAA   |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 1,139                 | 100%               | AAA   |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 1,135                 | 100%               | AAA   |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 1,051.5               | 92%                | AA    |



# Small Business Endpoint Security Awards

The following products win SE Labs awards:

- **Kaspersky Small Office Security**
- **Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)**
- **ESET Endpoint Security**
- **Sophos Intercept X**



- **Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection**



## SE Labs Monthly Newsletter

**Don't miss our security articles and reports**

- Test reports announced
- Blog posts reviewed
- Security testing analysed
- **NEW:** Podcast episodes





## 2. Threat Responses

### Full Attack Chain: Testing every layer of detection and protection

Attackers start from a certain point and don't stop until they have either achieved their goal or have reached the end of their resources (which could be a deadline or the limit of their abilities).

This means, in a test, the tester needs to begin the attack from a realistic first position, such as sending a phishing email or setting up an infected

website, and moving through many of the likely steps leading to actually stealing data or causing some other form of damage to the network.

If the test starts too far into the attack chain, such as executing malware on an endpoint, then many products will be denied opportunities to use the full extent of their protection and detection abilities.


If the test concludes before any 'useful' damage or theft has been achieved, then similarly the product may be denied a chance to demonstrate its abilities in behavioural detection and so on.

#### Attack Stages

The illustration below shows some typical stages of an attack. In a test each of these should be

### Attack Chain: How Hackers Progress


**Figure 1.** A typical attack starts with an initial contact and progresses through various stages, including reconnaissance, stealing data and causing damage.



**Figure 2.** This attack was initially successful but only able to progress as far as the reconnaissance phase.



**Figure 3.** A more successful attack manages to steal passwords but wholesale data theft and destruction was blocked.





attempted to determine the security solution's effectiveness. This test's results record detection and protection for each of these stages.

We measure how a product responds to the first stages of the attack with a detection and/ or protection rating. Sometimes products allow threats to run but detect them. Other times they might allow the threat to run briefly before neutralising it. Ideally, they detect and block the threat before it has a chance to run. Products may delete threats or automatically contain them in a 'quarantine' or other safe holding mechanism for later analysis.

Should the initial attack phase succeed we then measure post-exploitation stages, which are represented by steps two through to seven

below. We broadly categorise these stages as: Access (step 2); Action (step 3); Escalation (step 4); and Post-Escalation (step 5).

**In figure 1.** you can see a typical attack running from start to end, through various 'hacking' activities. This can be classified as a fully successful breach.









**In figure 2.** a product or service has interfered with the attack, allowing it to succeed only as far as stage 3, after which it was detected and neutralised. The attacker was unable to progress through stages 4 and onwards.

It is possible that attackers will not cause noticeable damage during an attack. It may be that their goal is persistent presence on the

systems to monitor for activities, slowly steal information and other more subtle missions.

**In figure 3.** the attacker has managed to progress as far as stage five. This means that the system has been seriously compromised. The attacker has a high level of access and has stolen passwords. However, attempts to exfiltrate data from the target were blocked, as were attempts to damage the system.

The table below shows how a typical way in which security testers illustrate attackers' behaviour. It is largely the same as our images above, but more detailed.

| MITRE Example Attack Chain Details  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Initial Access  | Execution   | Privilege Escalation  | Credential Access   | Discovery   | Collection  | Command and Control   | Exfiltration  |
| Spear Phishing via Service  | Command-Line Interface  | Bypass UAC  | Input Capture   | File and Directory Discovery  | Input Capture   | Data Encoding   | Exfiltration Over C2 Channel  |
| Spear Phishing Link   | PowerShell  |   | OS Credential Dumping   | Process Discovery   | Data from Local System  | Data Obfuscation  |   |
|   | Scripting   |   |   | System Information Discovery  |   |   |   |
|   | User Execution  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spear Phishing Link   | Scripting   | Bypass UAC  | OS Credential Dumping   | Process Discovery   | Data from Local System  | Data Obfuscation  | Exfiltration Over C2 Channel  |

## 3. Protection Ratings

The results below indicate how effectively the products dealt with threats. Points are earned for detecting the threat and for either blocking or neutralising it.

### ■ Detected (+1)

If the product detects the threat with any degree of useful information, we award it one point.

### ■ Blocked (+2)

Threats that are disallowed from even starting their malicious activities are blocked. Blocking products score two points.

### ■ Complete Remediation (+1)

If, in addition to neutralising a threat, the product removes all significant traces of the attack, it gains an additional one point.

### ■ Neutralised (+1)

Products that kill all running malicious processes 'neutralise' the threat and win one point.

### ■ Persistent Neutralisation (-2)

This result occurs when a product continually blocks a persistent threat from achieving its aim, while not removing it from the system.

### ■ Compromised (-5)

If the threat compromises the system, the product loses five points. This loss may be reduced to four points if it manages to detect the threat (see Detected, above), as this at least

alerts the user, who may now take steps to secure the system.

### Rating Calculations

We calculate the protection ratings using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Protection Rating} = & \\ & (1 \times \text{number of Detected}) + \\ & (2 \times \text{number of Blocked}) + \\ & (1 \times \text{number of Neutralised}) + \\ & (1 \times \text{number of Complete remediation}) + \\ & (-5 \times \text{number of Compromised}) \end{aligned}$$

The 'Complete remediation' number relates to cases of neutralisation in which all significant traces of the attack were removed from the target.

These ratings are based on our opinion of how important these different outcomes are. You may have a different view on how seriously you treat a 'Compromise' or 'Neutralisation without complete remediation'. If you want to create your own rating system, you can use the raw data from **5. Protection Details** on page 13 to roll your own set of personalised ratings.

### Targeted Attack Scoring

The following scores apply only to targeted attacks and are cumulative, ranging from -1 to -5.

#### ■ Access (-1)

If any command that yields information about the

target system is successful this score is applied. Examples of successful commands include listing current running processes, exploring the file system and so on. If the first command is attempted and the session is terminated by the product without the command being successful the score of Neutralised (see above) will be applied.

#### ■ Action (-1)

If the attacker is able to exfiltrate a document from the target's Desktop of the currently logged in user then an 'action' has been successfully taken.

#### ■ Escalation (-2)

The attacker attempts to escalate privileges to NT Authority/System. If successful, an additional two points are deducted.

#### ■ Post-Escalation Action (-1)

After escalation the attacker attempts actions that rely on escalated privileges. These include attempting to steal credentials, modifying the file system and recording keystrokes. If any of these actions are successful then a further penalty of one point deduction is applied.

# Enterprise Security Testing Services for CISOs

Elevate your cyber security strategy with SE Labs, the world's leading security testing organisation.

SE Labs works with large organisations to support CISOs and their security teams:

- Validate existing combination of security products and services.
- Provide expert partnership when choosing and deploying new security technologies.


SE Labs provides in-depth evaluations of the cyber security that you are considering, tailored to the exact, unique requirements of your business.

For an honest, objective and well-informed view of the cyber security industry contact us now at

[selabs.uk/contact](https://selabs.uk/contact)

| Protection Accuracy                        |                     |                         |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Product                                    | Protection Accuracy | Protection Accuracy (%) |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 400                 | 100%                    |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 400                 | 100%                    |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 399                 | 100%                    |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 395                 | 99%                     |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 322                 | 81%                     |

Average 96%



Protection Ratings are weighted to show that how products handle threats can be subtler than just 'win' or 'lose'.




# 4. Protection Scores

This graph shows the overall level of protection, making no distinction between neutralised and blocked incidents.

For each product we add Blocked and Neutralised cases together to make one simple tally.

| Protection Scores                          |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Product                                    | Protection Score |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 100              |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 100              |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 100              |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 100              |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 86               |




Protection Scores are a simple count of how many times a product protected the system.

## 5. Protection Details

These results break down how each product handled threats into some detail. You can see how many detected a threat and the levels of protection provided.

Products sometimes detect more threats than they protect against. This can happen when they recognise an element of the threat but aren't equipped to stop it. Products can also provide protection even if they don't detect certain threats. Some threats abort on detecting specific endpoint protection software.

| Protection Details                         |          |         |             |             |           |
|--|----------|---------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Product                                    | Detected | Blocked | Neutralised | Compromised | Protected |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 100      | 100     | 0           | 0           | 100       |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 100      | 100     | 0           | 0           | 100       |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 100      | 100     | 0           | 0           | 100       |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 100      | 98      | 2           | 0           | 100       |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 100      | 85      | 1           | 14          | 86        |




## 6. Legitimate Software Ratings

These ratings indicate how accurately the products classify legitimate applications and URLs, while also taking into account the interactions that each product has with the user. Ideally a product will either not classify a legitimate object or will classify it as safe. In neither case should it bother the user.

We also take into account the prevalence (popularity) of the applications and websites used in this part of the test, applying stricter penalties for when products misclassify very popular software and sites.

To understand how we calculate these ratings, see **6.3 Accuracy Ratings** on page 16.

| Legitimate Software Ratings                |                            |                         |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Product                                    | Legitimate Accuracy Rating | Legitimate Accuracy (%) |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 740                        | 100%                    |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 740                        | 100%                    |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 740                        | 100%                    |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 740                        | 100%                    |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 729.5                      | 99%                     |



Legitimate Software Ratings can indicate how well a vendor has tuned its detection engine.



## 6.1 Interaction Ratings

It's crucial that anti-malware endpoint products not only stop – or at least detect – threats, but that they allow legitimate applications to install and run without misclassifying them as malware. Such an error is known as a 'false positive' (FP).

In reality, genuine FPs are quite rare in testing. In our experience it is unusual for a legitimate application to be classified as 'malware'. More often it will be classified as 'unknown', 'suspicious' or 'unwanted' (or terms that mean much the same thing).

We use a subtle system of rating an endpoint's approach to legitimate objects, which takes into account how it classifies the application and how it presents that information to the user. Sometimes the endpoint software will pass the buck and demand that the user decide if the application is safe or not. In such cases the product may make a recommendation to allow or block. In other cases, the product will make no recommendation, which is possibly even less helpful.

If a product allows an application to install and run with no user interaction, or with simply a brief notification that the application is likely to be safe, it has achieved an optimum result. Anything else is a Non-Optimal Classification/Action (NOCA). We think that measuring NOCAs is more useful than counting the rarer FPs.

|                          | None (allowed) | Click to Allow (default allow) | Click to Allow/Block (no recommendation) | Click to Block (default block) | None (blocked) |   |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------------|---|
| Object is Safe           | 2              | 1.5                            | 1  |                                |                | A |
| Object is Unknown        | 2              | 1                              | 0.5                                      | 0                              | -0.5           | B |
| Object is not Classified | 2              | 0.5                            | 0  | -0.5                           | -1             | C |
| Object is Suspicious     | 0.5            | 0                              | -0.5                                     | -1                             | -1.5           | D |
| Object is Unwanted       | 0              | -0.5                           | -1                                       | -1.5                           | -2             | E |
| Object is Malicious      |                |                                |  | -2                             | -2             | F |
|                          | 1              | 2                              | 3  | 4                              | 5              |   |

| Interaction Ratings                        |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Product                                    | None (allowed) | None (blocked) |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 100            | 0              |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 100            | 0              |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 100            | 0              |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 100            | 0              |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 99             | 1              |

Products that do not bother users and classify most applications correctly earn more points than those that ask questions and condemn legitimate applications.

## 6.2 Prevalence Ratings

There is a significant difference between an endpoint product blocking a popular application such as the latest version of Microsoft Word and condemning a rare Iranian dating toolbar for Internet Explorer 6. One is very popular all over the world and its detection as malware (or something less serious but still suspicious) is a big deal. Conversely, the outdated toolbar won't have had a comparably large user base even when it was new. Detecting this application as malware may be wrong, but it is less impactful in the overall scheme of things.

With this in mind, we collected applications of varying popularity and sorted them into five separate categories, as follows:

1. Very High Impact
2. High Impact
3. Medium Impact
4. Low Impact
5. Very Low Impact

Incorrectly handling any legitimate application will invoke penalties, but classifying Microsoft Word as malware and blocking it without any way for the user to override this will bring far greater penalties than doing the same for an ancient niche toolbar. In order to calculate these relative penalties, we assigned each impact category with a rating modifier, as shown in the table above.

| Legitimate Software Prevalence Rating Modifiers |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Impact Category                                 | Rating Modifier |
| Very High Impact                                | 5               |
| High Impact                                     | 4               |
| Medium Impact                                   | 3               |
| Low Impact                                      | 2               |
| Very Low Impact                                 | 1               |

Applications were downloaded and installed during the test, but third-party download sites were avoided and original developers' URLs were used where possible. Download sites will sometimes bundle additional components into applications' install files, which may correctly cause anti-malware products to flag adware. We remove adware from the test set because it is often unclear how desirable this type of code is.

The prevalence for each application and URL is estimated using metrics such as third-party download sites and the data from Tranco.com's global traffic ranking system.

## 6.3 Accuracy Ratings

We calculate legitimate software accuracy ratings by multiplying together the interaction and prevalence ratings for each download and installation:

**Accuracy rating = Interaction rating x Prevalence rating**

If a product allowed one legitimate, Medium impact application to install with zero interaction with the user, then its Accuracy rating would be calculated like this:

**Accuracy rating = 2 x 3 = 6**

This same calculation is made for each legitimate application/site in the test and the results are summed and used to populate the graph and table shown under **6. Legitimate Software Ratings** on page 14.

## 6.4 Distribution of Impact Categories

Endpoint products that were most accurate in handling legitimate objects achieved the highest ratings. If all objects were of the highest prevalence, the maximum possible rating would be 1,000 (100 incidents x (2 interaction rating x 5 prevalence rating)).

In this test there was a range of applications with different levels of prevalence. The table below shows the frequency:

| Legitimate Software Category Frequency |           |
|--|-----------|
| Prevalence Rating                      | Frequency |
| Very High Impact                       | 32        |
| High Impact                            | 32        |
| Medium Impact                          | 17        |
| Low Impact                             | 12        |
| Very Low Impact                        | 7         |

## 7. Conclusions

Attacks in this test included threats that affect the wider public and more closely targeted individuals and organisations. You could say that we tested the products with 'public' malware and full-on hacking attacks.

We introduced the threats in a realistic way such that threats seen in the wild on websites were downloaded from those same websites, while threats caught spreading through email were delivered to our target systems as emails.

All of the products tested are well-known and should do well in this test. While we do 'create' threats by using publicly available free hacking tools, we do not write unique malware so there is no technical reason why any vendor being tested should do poorly.

The results were generally strong, particularly in the way that the products handled public threats. These are threats that are live on the Internet on the day that the products are tested. Excellent results from all the products indicate both familiarity with common threats and frequent updates to keep databases current.

Three of the five products were able to stop all the attacks. These belonged to **Microsoft**, **Kaspersky** and **ESET**. For these products, blocking the web download and the targeted attacks upon detection was key to stopping them.

**Sophos Intercept X** had allowed two attacks to run before neutralising them. By doing so, it likewise achieved 100% Protection Accuracy, making it strong enough to make it into the AAA rating zone.

**Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection** stopped all the malware that was downloaded from the web. However, it missed 14 out of 25 of the more evasive targeted attacks.

Most of the products handled the legitimate applications correctly, with no mistakes. **Webroot** blocked one legitimate application. Despite that, this is a particularly strong performance from all the products.

AAA award winners **Microsoft**, **Kaspersky**, **ESET** and **Sophos** stopped all the threats and allowed all legitimate applications. **Webroot** achieved an AA award by virtue of its 92% Total Accuracy rating.



# Appendices

## Appendix A: Terms Used

| Term                        | Meaning  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Compromised</b>          | The attack succeeded, resulting in malware running unhindered on the target. In the case of a targeted attack, the attacker was able to take remote control of the system and carry out a variety of tasks without hindrance.  |
| <b>Blocked</b>              | The attack was prevented from making any changes to the target.  |
| <b>False Positive</b>       | When a security product misclassifies a legitimate application or website as being malicious, it generates a 'false positive'.   |
| <b>Neutralised</b>          | The exploit or malware payload ran on the target but was subsequently removed.   |
| <b>Complete Remediation</b> | If a security product removes all significant traces of an attack, it has achieved complete remediation.   |
| <b>Target</b>               | The test system that is protected by a security product.   |
| <b>Threat</b>               | A program or sequence of interactions with the target that is designed to take some level of unauthorised control of that target.  |
| <b>Update</b>               | Security vendors provide information to their products in an effort to keep abreast of the latest threats. These updates may be downloaded in bulk as one or more files, or requested individually and live over the internet. |

## Appendix B: FAQs

A **full methodology** for this test is available from our website.

- The products chosen for this test were selected by SE Labs.
- The test was unsponsored.
- The test was conducted between 17th January and 20th March 2024.
- All products were configured according to each vendor's recommendations, when such recommendations were provided.
- Malicious URLs and legitimate applications and URLs were independently located and verified by SE Labs.
- Targeted attacks were selected and verified by SE Labs.
- Malicious and legitimate data was provided to partner organisations once the test was complete.
- The web browser used in this test was Google Chrome. When testing Microsoft products Chrome was equipped with the Windows Defender Browser Protection browser extension (<https://browserprotection.microsoft.com>). We allow other browser extensions when a tested product requests a user install one or more.

### **Q** What is a partner organisation? Can I become one to gain access to the threat data used in your tests?

**A** Partner organisations benefit from our consultancy services after a test has been run. Partners may gain access to low-level data that can be useful in product improvement initiatives and have permission to use award logos, where appropriate, for marketing purposes. We do not share data on one partner with other partners. We do not partner with organisations that do not engage in our testing.

### **Q** I am a security vendor and you tested my product without permission. May I access the threat data to verify that your results are accurate?

**A** We are willing to share a certain level of test data with non-partner participants for free. The intention is to provide sufficient data to demonstrate that the results are accurate. For more in-depth data suitable for product improvement purposes we recommend becoming a partner.

## Appendix C: Product Versions

The table below shows the service's name as it was being marketed at the time of the test.

| Product Versions |                                    |  |   |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Vendor           | Product                            | Build Version (start)  | Build Version (end)   |
| ESET             | Endpoint Security                  | 11.0.2032.0  | 11.0.2044.0   |
| Kaspersky        | Small Office Security              | 12.3.0.493 AES256  | 12.3.0.493 AES256   |
| Microsoft        | Defender Antivirus (enterprise)    | Antimalware Client Version: 4.18.23110.3<br>Engine Version: 1.1.23110.2<br>Antivirus Version: 1.403.2882.0<br>Anti-spyware Version: 1.403.2882.0 | Antimalware Client Version: 4.18.24010.12<br>Engine Version: 1.1.24020.9<br>Antivirus Version: 1.407.345.0<br>Anti-spyware Version: 1.407.345.0 |
| Sophos           | Intercept X                        | Core Agent: 2023.2.0.47<br>Sophos Intercept X: 2023.1.1.7<br>Device Encryption: 2023.2.0.7   | Core Agent: 2023.2.2.1<br>Sophos Intercept X: 2023.2.1.6<br>Device Encryption: 2023.2.0.7   |
| Webroot          | SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 9.0.35.12  | 9.0.35.12   |

# Appendix D: Attack Types

The table below shows how each product protected against the different types of attacks used in the test.

| Attack Types                               |                |                 |               |
|--|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Product                                    | General Attack | Targeted Attack | Protected (%) |
| ESET Endpoint Security                     | 75             | 25              | 100%          |
| Kaspersky Small Office Security            | 75             | 25              | 100%          |
| Microsoft Defender Antivirus (enterprise)  | 75             | 25              | 100%          |
| Sophos Intercept X                         | 75             | 25              | 100%          |
| Webroot SecureAnywhere Endpoint Protection | 75             | 11              | 72%           |

## DE:CODED

### Deciphering Cyber Security

Understand cyber security and other security issues. Practical and insightful, our experts have experience in attacking and defending in the physical and digital worlds. Peek behind the curtain with the Cyber Security **DE:CODED** podcast.

Listen on  
Apple Podcasts



PODCAST





### SE Labs Report Disclaimer

1. The information contained in this report is subject to change and revision by SE Labs without notice.
2. SE Labs is under no obligation to update this report at any time.
3. SE Labs believes that the information contained within this report is accurate and reliable at the time of its publication, which can be found at the bottom of the contents page, but SE Labs does not guarantee this in any way.
4. All use of and any reliance on this report, or any information contained within this report, is solely at your own risk. SE Labs shall not be liable or responsible for any loss of profit (whether incurred directly or indirectly), any loss of goodwill or business reputation, any loss of data suffered, pure economic loss, cost of procurement of substitute goods or services, or other intangible loss, or any indirect, incidental, special or consequential loss, costs, damages, charges or expenses or exemplary damages arising his report in any way whatsoever.
5. The contents of this report does not constitute a recommendation, guarantee, endorsement or otherwise of any of the products listed, mentioned or tested.
6. The testing and subsequent results do not guarantee that there are no errors in the products, or that you will achieve the same or similar results. SE Labs does not guarantee in any way that the products will meet your expectations, requirements, specifications or needs.
7. Any trade marks, trade names, logos or images used in this report are the trade marks, trade names, logos or images of their respective owners.
8. The contents of this report are provided on an "AS IS" basis and accordingly SE Labs does not make any express or implied warranty or representation concerning its accuracy or completeness.