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Reviewer’s report:

The revised version of the manuscript has improved its quality and readability, although the availability and consistency of data are still critical issues, as acknowledged by the authors. Most of the queries of the reviewers have been addressed.

Minor essential review:
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”.

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

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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