NORDIC HOOPS ANALYTICS

TECHNICAL GAME REPORT

BOX SCORE + PLAY-BY-PLAY ANALYSIS

Fyllingen 68 - 80 Gimle

20/09/2026 | BLNO MEN

EXECUTIVE ANALYST REPORT

MATCH VERDICT

Gimle won by 12 through the combined effect of 9.7 points of offensive-rating advantage, stronger shot conversion and the ability to protect more possessions.

1. SHOT VALUE: Fyllingen 42.6% eFG% versus Gimle 41%.

2. POSSESSION SECURITY: TOV% was 12.9% versus 14.9%.

3. OFFENSIVE REBOUNDING: OREB totals were 7 versus 11; extra chances must be connected to efficient scoring.

4. PACE: estimated possessions were 78.2 and 82.8, not simply the number of field-goal attempts.

5. GAME CONTROL: the scoring flow below identifies when the margin expanded or contracted.

SCORING FLOW AND TEMPO

PERIOD	Fyllingen	Gimle	CUMULATIVE
Q1	21	25	21 - 25
Q2	20	21	41 - 46
Q3	18	16	59 - 62
Q4	9	18	68 - 80

SCORING RATE / GAME TEMPO

METRIC	Fyllingen	Gimle
Points per minute	1.7	2
Points per possession	0.87	0.967
Possessions per minute	1.95	2.07
Seconds per possession	30.7	29
Estimated ORTG	87	96.7

CUMULATIVE SCORE



Fyllingen 68 Gimle 80

ANALYST NOTE

The pace profile is separated from the scoring profile: a team can play at similar volume but generate a very different number of points per possession. Gimle scored 0.967 points per estimated possession.

COMPLETE TEAM BOX SCORE

STAT	Fyllingen	Gimle	WHY IT MATTERS
Points	68	80	-12
FGM - FGA	27 - 68	25 - 67	2 makes
2PT	23/43	20/40	interior conversion
3PT	4/25	5/27	perimeter volume
FT	10/14	25/29	line pressure
OREB - DREB	7 - 25	11 - 34	-4 OREB
Total rebounds	32	45	second chances
Assists	11	19	creation
Turnovers	11	14	possession cost
Steals	11	7	pressure
Blocks	2	2	rim events

ADVANCED TEAM PROFILE

METRIC	Fyllingen	Gimle	INTERPRETATION
ORTG	87	96.7	Gimle offensive edge
DRTG	96.7	87	lower is better
NET RTG	-9.7	9.7	single-game net
eFG%	42.6%	41%	shot value
TS%	45.8%	50.2%	free throws included
TOV%	12.9%	14.9%	possessions ending early
OREB%	17.1%	30.6%	second-chance share
FTr	20.6%	43.3%	FTA per FGA
AST/FGM%	40.7%	76%	assisted makes
3PA rate	36.8%	40.3%	perimeter diet

Possessions = FGA + 0.44 x FTA - OREB + TOV. DRTG uses opponent points over each team's estimated possessions.

SHOT ECONOMY

SHOOTING CHANNEL	Fyllingen	Gimle	ANALYTICAL READING
Points from 2PT	46	40	interior scoring
Points from 3PT	12	15	perimeter scoring
Points from FT	10	25	line pressure
2PT FG%	53.5%	50%	conversion
3PT FG%	16%	18.5%	perimeter conversion
FT%	71.4%	86.2%	free-throw conversion
Paint / 2PT attempt share	63.2%	59.7%	interior volume
3PT attempt share	36.8%	40.3%	perimeter volume

WHAT THIS MEANS ON COURT

The comparison must distinguish makes, attempts and points. Identical three-point makes can coexist with very different efficiency if one team needs more attempts; the higher-leverage separator is usually the combination of two-point conversion, turnovers and free-throw pressure.

SHOT-TIME PROFILE

WINDOW	H FGA	H FG%	H eFG%	H PTS	A FGA	A FG%	A eFG%	A PTS
EARLY | 24-17 sec	13	46.2%	50%	13	11	54.5%	59.1%	13
MIDDLE | 16-9 sec	28	39.3%	41.1%	23	22	40.9%	45.5%	20
LATE | 8-0 sec	17	41.2%	47.1%	16	21	23.8%	23.8%	10
CLASSIFIED TOTAL	58	46.6%	46.6%	58	54	46.3%	46.3%	55

IMPORTANT INTERPRETATION

Classified attempts: 58/68 for Fyllingen and 54/67 for Gimle. No official shot-clock field exists in the source; windows are reconstructed from game-clock events, made baskets, rebounds, turnovers and qualifying resets.

POSSESSION BATTLE

POSSESSION EVENT	Fyllingen	Gimle	COACHING INTERPRETATION
Estimated possessions	78.2	82.8	volume
Turnovers	11	14	lost opportunities
Steals	11	7	disruption
Offensive rebounds	7	11	extended possessions
Defensive rebounds	25	34	finished sequences
Total rebounds	32	45	overall board
Blocks	2	2	rim protection

PBP events loaded: 922. Scoring is checked against the official final score before a report is generated.

Fyllingen - FULL PLAYER TABLE

PLAYER	MIN	PTS	FGA	3PA	FTA	2P%	3P%	eFG%	TS%	USG%	AST	TO	REB
Troy Barnies	34.4	13	14	3	2	54.5	0	42.9	43.7	21.6	1	2	5
Kalob James Ledoux	31.8	17	17	5	4	41.7	20	38.2	45.3	24	0	0	3
Fredrik Kleivdal	28.6	5	6	4	0	50	25	41.7	41.7	7.7	2	0	7
Nikolas Kvåle Skouen	23.7	2	6	3	0	33.3	0	16.7	16.7	10.2	2	2	5
Pol Olivier Cañadell	22.1	2	3	2	4	0	0	0	21	8.6	3	2	3
Sigurd Hakami Sandal	21.9	3	6	3	2	33.3	0	16.7	21.8	11.4	0	2	2
Lars Andreas Nilsen	18	16	7	3	2	100	66.7	100	101.5	11.4	1	1	3
Davonte Ray Davis	13.8	10	9	2	0	71.4	0	55.6	55.6	14.1	2	2	3
Rory Leandro Kitwana Pantophlet	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

eFG% accounts for the added value of three-point makes. TS% includes free throws. USG% estimates the share of team possessions finished by the player.

Gimle - FULL PLAYER TABLE

PLAYER	MIN	PTS	FGA	3PA	FTA	2P%	3P%	eFG%	TS%	USG%	AST	TO	REB
Jørgen Odfjell	36.5	18	19	8	5	45.5	12.5	34.2	42.5	28	4	2	9
Jørgen Andreas Lamo	35.4	20	14	7	8	71.4	14.3	46.4	57.1	21.2	1	0	12
Lars Fredrik Mensah Espe	34.4	20	8	1	8	85.7	100	93.8	86.8	15.1	11	1	3
Jovan Radulovic	23.2	6	5	1	2	50	0	40	51	11.9	0	4	10
Kristoffer Gjerde Sætren	18.7	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	10.9	1	2	0
Isak Smørholm Ulveseth	18.1	5	9	4	0	20	25	27.8	27.8	15.7	0	4	2
Sverre Berge Hannisdal	12.2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0	0	4
Milovan Savic	11	8	2	0	6	50	0	50	86.2	6.8	2	1	3
Tobias Aleksander Clemm	10.5	3	2	2	0	0	50	75	75	2.4	0	0	2

eFG% accounts for the added value of three-point makes. TS% includes free throws. USG% estimates the share of team possessions finished by the player.

PLAYER PRODUCTION PER 100

PLAYER	TEAM	PTS/100	REB/100	AST/100	STL/100	TO/100	TS%	USG%
Jørgen Andreas Lamo	Gimle	24.2	14.5	1.2	1.2	0	57.1	21.2
Lars Fredrik Mensah Espe	Gimle	24.2	3.6	13.3	3.6	1.2	86.8	15.1
Kalob James Ledoux	Fyllingen	21.8	3.8	0	3.8	0	45.3	24
Jørgen Odfjell	Gimle	21.7	10.9	4.8	1.2	2.4	42.5	28
Lars Andreas Nilsen	Fyllingen	20.5	3.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	101.5	11.4
Troy Barnies	Fyllingen	16.6	6.4	1.3	0	2.6	43.7	21.6
Davonte Ray Davis	Fyllingen	12.8	3.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	55.6	14.1
Milovan Savic	Gimle	9.7	3.6	2.4	0	1.2	86.2	6.8
Jovan Radulovic	Gimle	7.2	12.1	0	0	4.8	51	11.9
Fredrik Kleivdal	Fyllingen	6.4	9	2.6	2.6	0	41.7	7.7
Isak Smørholm Ulveseth	Gimle	6	2.4	0	1.2	4.8	27.8	15.7
Sigurd Hakami Sandal	Fyllingen	3.8	2.6	0	1.3	2.6	21.8	11.4
Tobias Aleksander Clemm	Gimle	3.6	2.4	0	0	0	75	2.4
Nikolas Kvåle Skouen	Fyllingen	2.6	6.4	2.6	1.3	2.6	16.7	10.2
Pol Olivier Cañadell	Fyllingen	2.6	3.8	3.8	0	2.6	21	8.6
Rory Leandro Kitwana Pantophlet	Fyllingen	0	1.3	0	1.3	0	0	0
Kristoffer Gjerde Sætren	Gimle	0	0	1.2	1.2	2.4	0	10.9
Sverre Berge Hannisdal	Gimle	0	4.8	0	0	0	0	1.2

Per-100 values are normalised to each team's estimated possessions. They are not season averages and should be interpreted alongside minutes and role.

PLAYER-LEVEL ANALYST READ

Gimle: EFFICIENT CORE

Lars Andreas Nilsen (16 pts, 101.5 TS%, 20.5 PTS/100), Lars Fredrik Mensah Espe (20 pts, 86.8 TS%, 24.2 PTS/100), Jørgen Andreas Lamo (20 pts, 57.1 TS%, 24.2 PTS/100) led the most efficient scoring profiles among players with a meaningful attempt sample.

SCORING DISTRIBUTION

The leading scorers were Jørgen Andreas Lamo (20), Lars Fredrik Mensah Espe (20), Jørgen Odfjell (18). The key question is whether the scoring came from sustainable shot quality, free throws or high-volume attempts.

CREATION AND SECURITY

Lars Fredrik Mensah Espe supplied 11 assists. Jovan Radulovic recorded 4 turnovers, so creation quality must be evaluated together with possession cost.

DATA, METHODS AND CONFIDENCE

OFFICIAL BOX SCORE

Team and player totals come from the official match record.

POSSESSION FORMULA

Estimated possessions = FGA + 0.44 x FTA - OREB + TOV.

ADVANCED RATES

ORTG, DRTG, NET RTG, eFG%, TS%, TOV%, OREB%, FTr, AST/FGM% and 3PA rate are calculated from the box score.

PLAYER RATES

PTS/100, REB/100, AST/100, STL/100 and TO/100 use each team's estimated possessions. USG% is the player's estimated finishing share.

SHOT-TIME RECONSTRUCTION

The play-by-play has game-clock events but no official shot-clock field. Possession starts and resets are reconstructed from event order.

QUALITY CONTROL

922 play-by-play events were loaded; scoring is validated against the final score and malformed parent events are excluded from chronology calculations.

LIMITATION

This is a one-game descriptive analysis. It explains this match and does not establish a repeatable team identity without a larger sample.

FINAL COACHING CONCLUSIONS

FOR FYLLINGEN

Protect the most efficient shot areas, reduce possessions ending in live-ball turnovers and connect offensive rebounds to higher-value attempts. Compare the team's 2PT, 3PT and free-throw profile before making a shooting-only diagnosis.

FOR GIMLE

Preserve the possession and shot-quality advantages that produced the result, but test whether the same profile survives against a different defensive scheme and a larger sample.

MATCH IN ONE SENTENCE

Gimle combined the stronger points-per-possession profile with the better balance between shot value, possession security and scoring distribution.