

Dear Reviewer,

Again, thank you very much for your comments in this second round. We replicate the key elements of your comments in the bold text. Our response then follows. In addition, we highlighted all changes in the revised manuscript in yellow.

1. P. 21: "Our paper tries to shed first light on the pandemic's expected impact on professional football." - Given the already extensive and growing literature on this topic, "first" is a bit presumptuous. The reference to some of the already existing literature on p. 3 seems crude, contrived and bumpy.

Thank you very much for your comment. We agree that the old Section 2.1 ("The COVID-19 pandemic") was not well structured and a bit confusing. In the revised manuscript, we decided to divide this section into 2 parts: First, we describe the COVID-19 pandemic (Section 2.1) and second we present the academic research on the COVID-19 pandemic and sports (Section 2.2).

In addition, we removed the presumptuous "first" when we explained the contribution of our paper.

2. Predictions are always problematic when they concern the future and those mentioned in the paper may already be outdated by the latest developments on the European Super League as well as the reform of the UEFA Champions League. Perhaps the authors could point out this limitation - which should not be underestimated - of their statements.

We followed your good advice and added a paragraph to Section 6 (Conclusion) where we point out the limitation of predictions: *"Third, because the future is inherently uncertain, all predictions into the future need to cope with uncertainties [66,67] and may already be out-dated soon afterwards, as the most recent developments regarding the European Super League, as well as the reform of the UEFA Champions League drastically show."*