

**ReviewForm1.7**

JournalName:	AsianResearchJournalofArts &SocialSciences
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_ARJASS_110962
Titleofthe Manuscript:	ASSESSINGTHEIMPLICATIONOFPLEABARGAIN UNDERACJA, 2015INNIGERIA’SANTI-CORRUPTIONCRUSADE:LESSONSFROMKENYA
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

**ReviewForm1.7**  
**PART1:ReviewComments**

	Reviewer'scomment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that a author should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISIONcomments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p><b>It is an article which compiles the provisions in the law books and summarises the current status on plea bargaining. It is useful to the law students, practitioners of law and also to the general public.</b></p> <p><b>Yes it is suitable.</b></p> <p><b>Yes it is comprehensive</b></p> <p><b>Yes the structure and subsections are appropriate.</b></p> <p><b>It can be believed, based on the references provided, that they are scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>I am not conversant with the Laws of the other countries. But, I have experience of implementing anti-corruption measures in India and have worked as senior public official for long years. Based on my work experience, I find that this article is good compilation enough for publication as it quotes recent references.</b></p> <p><b>The work of compilation is appreciated.</b></p>	<p>We agree with the reviewer's comments and have corrected accordingly</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISIONcomments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>Yes. It is simple and good enough. I would suggest that a author may consider re-submit the article by deleting repetitions in sentences / words / ideas. I found it, though only at very few places.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>It serves the purpose of summarising the current status of provisions of law and good for publication. This article is not about any new idea or innovation as stated in the title and abstract.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	