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Dear editor,

Thank you to the reviewers for their second detailed review of this paper and their positive feedback on our revisions. We are glad to hereby submit a second revised version addressing the remaining comments.

Here below, we describe the changes we made to the paper.

The issue of “how they [funders] DECIDE what gets funded” was not addressed in the paper. I suggest changing the title and all reference to read as “what they fund and how funds are distributed”.

Answer: We agree, how funders decide what gets funded actually consists of two components: priority setting mechanisms and funding distribution mechanisms. We have only described one of these. We have revised the title, abstract and main text to reflect better this nuance.

I suggest to include in that the conclusion some reference about your findings and not only to reiterate the need of transparency and harmonization.

Answer: we have addressed this as suggested.