

I have read over the review by Alvarado and Reyes-López entitled, “Sol-gel ceramics for SEIRAS substrates”. I want to first thank the authors for reviewing a subject that is of importance to several scientific communities. Reviewing a subject always requires quite a bit of work and is a service to those communities of scientists and technologists.

However, I do have some concerns about the review that I would like the authors to think about.

First and foremost, I do not understand why a review of glassy ceramics (which are for the most part are completely amorphous) would be submitted to this particular journal, whose focus is on crystalline material research. There seems to be a disconnect here that I will let the editor make the final decision on.

Second, while the title of the review defines the focus area as sol-gel materials for SEIRAS (which is not defined anywhere in the article [?Surface Enhanced IR ?Absorption? Spectroscopy?]). However, upon looking over the organization of the article one cannot help but notice that almost the real first mention of SEIRAS in the article comes in section 4 near the end of page 7 of this 8 page review. Furthermore, section 4 is only one short paragraph long to go with one table (Table 4). This paragraph and table appear to be the entirety of the information presented in the review that is specifically focused on the title subject of the review. I don't understand this.

The main part of the manuscript (6+ pages of 8, not counting references) is a rather brief overview of the basics of sol-gel reactions and technologies that have been reviewed countless times in the last thirty years. The discontinuity between the defined focus area of the manuscript and what is actually reviewed is a major concern.

My best advice to the authors is to completely rewrite the review and focus in much more detail on the needs of SERS and SEIRAS based spectroscopies and how sol-gel-derived surfaces answer these needs.