



Computer Science

---

**Opponent(s):**

**Peter Hjærtquist and Erik Möller**

**Respondent(s):**

**Robert Josefson and Margaret Mburu**

**Conversion of a Visual Basic 6 application to  
Visual Basic .NET**

---

# **1 A General Evaluation of the Project**

The work with this project is well performed. The writers obviously know what they are talking about and the task was successfully performed. It is easy to follow the approach of the work. There are some careless mistakes in the dissertation, but in general, it is a well-performed project.

## **2 Comments on the Project in Relation to the Dissertation**

### **2.1 Title**

The title is good. When reading the title, you know exactly what to expect from the dissertation.

### **2.2 Dissertation Layout**

The layout of the report is good and there is a red thread in the report. The background/introduction of XML and the Windows registry maybe should have been put in the background chapter (chapter 2). The result part is not obvious, a chapter/section named result would have been appreciated. There is one section named results (3.3), but it does not contain the results from the project but from the upgrade wizard. There are results later in the report, but it is not obvious where to find them. Chapter 4 maybe should have been named Results instead of Recommendations.

### **2.3 Scientific Method**

The scientific method is good but several terms are used without introduction, for example ReDim, the App class and OLE. Some introductions for the tools and features are too short in order to create an understanding, for example RAD.

## **2.4 Argumentation and Conclusions**

The conclusion section is short and concise but some information (We learnt....) feels more like evaluation than conclusions.

## **2.5 The Abstract**

The abstract clearly presents the goals of the project, to convert the source code and determine the most efficient method of converting source code. However, the results are not mentioned in the abstract.

## **2.6 Language Aspects**

Throughout the whole report there are very few commas used, this makes many sentences hard to understand. There are also a few spelling mistakes, but these are minor.

## **2.7 References and Sources**

Among the references to internet sites, 5 out of 17 have no web address but instead, presumably, the topic of the site the missing address would have referred to. Throughout the whole report, there are few references to the figures, i.e. many figures are not referred to. In addition, there are cross references referring to the wrong section and even a section reference which probably should refer to a figure.

## **2.8 General Comments on the Project**

In general, this dissertation is good. There are several careless mistakes throughout the dissertation. These mistakes includes, for example, section topics in uppercase only and cross-references referring to the wrong source. It seems that the report was finished in haste and these small mistakes are easily fixed. Fixing these simple mistakes would significantly increase the quality of the dissertation.

It is a good initiative to include a glossary in the end, should it not be mentioned in the Document Outline in chapter 1?

Though there are function headers included, more detailed code examples would relieve the understanding of the examples.

There are a few bullet lists without introduction (e.g. the one in 4.1.5).

Throughout the dissertation, there are a couple of words used interchangeably; conversion, migration, upgrading and transition referring to the conversion of the VB6 application to VB.NET. We do not believe that all these words are synonyms and explanation of one word and using only that word would simplify the understanding of the purpose of the dissertation.

### **3 Chapter by Chapter Evaluation of the Dissertation**

#### **3.1 Chapter 1**

The chapter contains the information you need for understanding the purpose of the project. We miss a reference to the glossary.

#### **3.2 Chapter 2**

Good background information but we miss background information for XML and the Windows registry.

#### **3.3 Chapter 3**

It is easy to find the red thread in this chapter.

It is sometimes difficult to understand what problem is before the solution is given. In section 3.4.2, an external procedure which takes, among others, a parameter of type “any” is described. This is not supported in VB.NET and is solved by either overloading or modifying the procedure. We do not fully understand the problem and the solution. A code example of this problem and solution would ease our understanding. In section 3.4.3, there is a descriptive introduction but it is unclear what the problem with the constants is. There are also terms that are not introduced before used in the contents of the text, as section 3.4.4 where ParamArray is used but not introduced.

In section 3.5.3 there is an example where an imagelist with size 4 only has the size 3 when converted to .NET. This statement needs further explanation.

### **3.4 Chapter 4**

This chapter is well written. Maybe this chapter could be renamed to Results as it describes results of the project?

There are 8 steps in the checklist in section 4.1.1 but there are no explanations of step 4 and 8.

### **3.5 Chapter 5**

A contradiction about defining the lower bound of an array in VB6 is located in section 5.3.1. In section 3.5.3 it is stated that an array can begin at either position 0 or 1 for VB6 and in section 5.3.1 it is stated that an array in VB6 can begin with any positive integer.

### **3.6 General Comments on the Dissertation**

No further comments.

## **4 Final Comments**

It is a well performed work, but the dissertation is in need of a little polishing. The red thread is obvious and it is easy to follow the workflow.