

NORDIC HOOPS ANALYTICS

# TECHNICAL GAME REPORT

BOX SCORE + PLAY-BY-PLAY ANALYSIS



**Fyllingen 110 - 68 Tromsø Storm**

26/09/2026 | BLNO MEN

# EXECUTIVE ANALYST REPORT

## MATCH VERDICT

Fyllingen won by 42 through the combined effect of 47.5 points of offensive-rating advantage, stronger shot conversion and the ability to protect more possessions.

- 1** SHOT VALUE: Fyllingen 60% eFG% versus Tromsø Storm 41.9%.
- 2** POSSESSION SECURITY: TOV% was 13.6% versus 18.5%.
- 3** OFFENSIVE REBOUNDING: OREB totals were 12 versus 5; extra chances must be connected to efficient scoring.
- 4** PACE: estimated possessions were 90.8 and 92.3, 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 | Tromsø Storm | CUMULATIVE |
|--------|-----------|--------------|------------|
| Q1     | 18        | 22           | 18 - 22    |
| Q2     | 29        | 14           | 47 - 36    |
| Q3     | 26        | 15           | 73 - 51    |
| Q4     | 37        | 17           | 110 - 68   |

## SCORING RATE / GAME TEMPO

| METRIC                 | Fyllingen | Tromsø Storm |
|------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Points per minute      | 2.75      | 1.7          |
| Points per possession  | 1.211     | 0.737        |
| Possessions per minute | 2.27      | 2.31         |
| Seconds per possession | 26.4      | 26           |
| Estimated ORTG         | 121.1     | 73.7         |

## CUMULATIVE SCORE



## 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. Fyllingen scored 1.211 points per estimated possession.

COMPLETE TEAM BOX SCORE

| STAT           | Fyllingen | Tromsø Storm | WHY IT MATTERS      |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|---------------------|
| Points         | 110       | 68           | 42                  |
| FGM - FGA      | 39 - 80   | 27 - 74      | 12 makes            |
| 2PT            | 21/40     | 19/41        | interior conversion |
| 3PT            | 18/40     | 8/33         | perimeter volume    |
| FT             | 14/20     | 6/12         | line pressure       |
| OREB - DREB    | 12 - 35   | 5 - 28       | 7 OREB              |
| Total rebounds | 47        | 33           | second chances      |
| Assists        | 23        | 15           | creation            |
| Turnovers      | 14        | 18           | possession cost     |
| Steals         | 12        | 7            | pressure            |
| Blocks         | 5         | 1            | rim events          |

ADVANCED TEAM PROFILE

| METRIC   | Fyllingen | Tromsø Storm | INTERPRETATION           |
|----------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------|
| ORTG     | 121.1     | 73.7         | Fyllingen offensive edge |
| DRTG     | 73.7      | 121.1        | lower is better          |
| NET RTG  | 47.5      | -47.5        | single-game net          |
| eFG%     | 60%       | 41.9%        | shot value               |
| TS%      | 61.9%     | 42.9%        | free throws included     |
| TOV%     | 13.6%     | 18.5%        | possessions ending early |
| OREB%    | 30%       | 12.5%        | second-chance share      |
| FTr      | 25%       | 16.2%        | FTA per FGA              |
| AST/FGM% | 59%       | 55.6%        | assisted makes           |
| 3PA rate | 50%       | 44.6%        | 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 | Tromsø Storm | ANALYTICAL READING    |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Points from 2PT           | 42        | 38           | interior scoring      |
| Points from 3PT           | 54        | 24           | perimeter scoring     |
| Points from FT            | 14        | 6            | line pressure         |
| 2PT FG%                   | 52.5%     | 46.3%        | conversion            |
| 3PT FG%                   | 45%       | 24.2%        | perimeter conversion  |
| FT%                       | 70%       | 50%          | free-throw conversion |
| Paint / 2PT attempt share | 50%       | 55.4%        | interior volume       |
| 3PT attempt share         | 50%       | 44.6%        | 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 | 21    | 61.9% | 76.2%  | 32    | 14    | 42.9% | 46.4%  | 13    |
| MIDDLE   16-9 sec | 36    | 41.7% | 51.4%  | 37    | 36    | 33.3% | 41.7%  | 30    |
| LATE   8-0 sec    | 17    | 52.9% | 61.8%  | 21    | 15    | 53.3% | 56.7%  | 17    |
| CLASSIFIED TOTAL  | 74    | 52.7% | 52.7%  | 96    | 65    | 41.5% | 41.5%  | 62    |

## IMPORTANT INTERPRETATION

Classified attempts: 74/80 for Fyllingen and 65/74 for Tromsø Storm. 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 | Tromsø Storm | COACHING INTERPRETATION |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Estimated possessions | 90.8      | 92.3         | volume                  |
| Turnovers             | 14        | 18           | lost opportunities      |
| Steals                | 12        | 7            | disruption              |
| Offensive rebounds    | 12        | 5            | extended possessions    |
| Defensive rebounds    | 35        | 28           | finished sequences      |
| Total rebounds        | 47        | 33           | overall board           |
| Blocks                | 5         | 1            | rim protection          |

PBP events loaded: 964. 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 |
|--------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----|-----|
| Kalob James Ledoux             | 34.7 | 40  | 23  | 16  | 5   | 57.1 | 56.3 | 76.1 | 79.4 | 31.1 | 7   | 3  | 7   |
| Troy Barnies                   | 27.6 | 10  | 6   | 5   | 2   | 0    | 60   | 75   | 72.7 | 9.8  | 1   | 2  | 9   |
| Davonte Ray Davis              | 27.5 | 23  | 19  | 8   | 2   | 54.5 | 37.5 | 55.3 | 57.8 | 25.2 | 9   | 3  | 7   |
| Fredrik Kleivdal               | 24.2 | 6   | 8   | 4   | 2   | 25   | 25   | 31.3 | 33.8 | 12   | 0   | 2  | 1   |
| Sigurd Hakami Sandal           | 20.9 | 10  | 7   | 3   | 3   | 100  | 0    | 57.1 | 60.1 | 10.3 | 2   | 1  | 6   |
| Nikolas Kvåle Skouen           | 17.2 | 0   | 2   | 1   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 4.4  | 0   | 2  | 4   |
| Pol Olivier Cañadell           | 14   | 7   | 6   | 0   | 2   | 50   | 0    | 50   | 50.9 | 7.6  | 3   | 0  | 3   |
| Evert Dahlberg                 | 12.5 | 12  | 5   | 3   | 4   | 100  | 66.7 | 100  | 88.8 | 7.4  | 1   | 0  | 1   |
| Rory Leandro Kitwana Pantophlé | 11.1 | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 2.2  | 0   | 1  | 5   |
| Intele Kevin Lomboto           | 5.2  | 2   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 33.3 | 0    | 33.3 | 33.3 | 3.3  | 0   | 0  | 3   |
| Nicolas Gundersen Ballone      | 5.2  | 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.

Tromsø Storm - FULL PLAYER TABLE

| PLAYER                      | MIN  | PTS | FGA | 3PA | FTA | 2P%  | 3P%  | eFG% | TS%  | USG% | AST | TO | REB |
|-----------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----|-----|
| Johannes Rydningen Lange    | 39.2 | 25  | 28  | 12  | 2   | 56.3 | 16.7 | 42.9 | 43.3 | 38.9 | 7   | 7  | 4   |
| Anders Isaksen Solem        | 30.1 | 15  | 7   | 5   | 4   | 50   | 80   | 100  | 85.6 | 12.7 | 2   | 3  | 6   |
| Jakob Heier Kantola         | 25.1 | 0   | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 4.3  | 3   | 1  | 4   |
| Isak Emanuel Ramirez Nilsen | 24.1 | 9   | 7   | 2   | 4   | 40   | 50   | 50   | 51.4 | 12.7 | 1   | 3  | 9   |
| Trym Andreas Engelsen       | 22.4 | 11  | 13  | 8   | 2   | 60   | 12.5 | 34.6 | 39.6 | 16.1 | 0   | 1  | 2   |
| Erlend Suhr Fandrem         | 19.5 | 2   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 33.3 | 0    | 33.3 | 33.3 | 3.3  | 1   | 0  | 4   |
| David Berntsen              | 15.3 | 4   | 4   | 0   | 0   | 50   | 0    | 50   | 50   | 4.3  | 1   | 0  | 2   |
| Brage Haftor Engelsen       | 14.2 | 2   | 5   | 2   | 0   | 33.3 | 0    | 20   | 20   | 7.6  | 0   | 2  | 1   |
| Håkon Andre Skog            | 9.9  | 0   | 4   | 2   | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 5.4  | 0   | 1  | 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.

PLAYER PRODUCTION PER 100

| PLAYER                          | TEAM         | PTS/100 | REB/100 | AST/100 | STL/100 | TO/100 | TS%  | USG% |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|------|------|
| Kalob James Ledoux              | Fyllingen    | 44.1    | 7.7     | 7.7     | 2.2     | 3.3    | 79.4 | 31.1 |
| Johannes Rydningen Lange        | Tromsø Storm | 27.1    | 4.3     | 7.6     | 3.3     | 7.6    | 43.3 | 38.9 |
| Davonte Ray Davis               | Fyllingen    | 25.3    | 7.7     | 9.9     | 1.1     | 3.3    | 57.8 | 25.2 |
| Anders Isaksen Solem            | Tromsø Storm | 16.3    | 6.5     | 2.2     | 1.1     | 3.3    | 85.6 | 12.7 |
| Evert Dahlberg                  | Fyllingen    | 13.2    | 1.1     | 1.1     | 1.1     | 0      | 88.8 | 7.4  |
| Trym Andreas Engelsen           | Tromsø Storm | 11.9    | 2.2     | 0       | 0       | 1.1    | 39.6 | 16.1 |
| Troy Barnies                    | Fyllingen    | 11      | 9.9     | 1.1     | 3.3     | 2.2    | 72.7 | 9.8  |
| Sigurd Hakami Sandal            | Fyllingen    | 11      | 6.6     | 2.2     | 2.2     | 1.1    | 60.1 | 10.3 |
| Isak Emanuel Ramirez Nilsen     | Tromsø Storm | 9.8     | 9.8     | 1.1     | 3.3     | 3.3    | 51.4 | 12.7 |
| Pol Olivier Cañadell            | Fyllingen    | 7.7     | 3.3     | 3.3     | 1.1     | 0      | 50.9 | 7.6  |
| Fredrik Kleivdal                | Fyllingen    | 6.6     | 1.1     | 0       | 0       | 2.2    | 33.8 | 12   |
| David Berntsen                  | Tromsø Storm | 4.3     | 2.2     | 1.1     | 0       | 0      | 50   | 4.3  |
| Intele Kevin Lomboto            | Fyllingen    | 2.2     | 3.3     | 0       | 0       | 0      | 33.3 | 3.3  |
| Erlend Suhr Fandrem             | Tromsø Storm | 2.2     | 4.3     | 1.1     | 0       | 0      | 33.3 | 3.3  |
| Brage Haftor Engelsen           | Tromsø Storm | 2.2     | 1.1     | 0       | 0       | 2.2    | 20   | 7.6  |
| Jakob Heier Kantola             | Tromsø Storm | 0       | 4.3     | 3.3     | 0       | 1.1    | 0    | 4.3  |
| Håkon Andre Skog                | Tromsø Storm | 0       | 1.1     | 0       | 0       | 1.1    | 0    | 5.4  |
| Nikolas Kvåle Skouen            | Fyllingen    | 0       | 4.4     | 0       | 1.1     | 2.2    | 0    | 4.4  |
| Rory Leandro Kitwana Pantophlet | Fyllingen    | 0       | 5.5     | 0       | 1.1     | 1.1    | 0    | 2.2  |
| Nicolas Gundersen Ballone       | Fyllingen    | 0       | 1.1     | 0       | 0       | 0      | 0    | 0    |

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

## Fyllingen: EFFICIENT CORE

Evert Dahlberg (12 pts, 88.8 TS%, 13.2 PTS/100), Anders Isaksen Solem (15 pts, 85.6 TS%, 16.3 PTS/100), Kalob James Ledoux (40 pts, 79.4 TS%, 44.1 PTS/100) led the most efficient scoring profiles among players with a meaningful attempt sample.

## SCORING DISTRIBUTION

The leading scorers were Kalob James Ledoux (40), Johannes Rydningen Lange (25), Davonte Ray Davis (23). The key question is whether the scoring came from sustainable shot quality, free throws or high-volume attempts.

## CREATION AND SECURITY

Davonte Ray Davis supplied 9 assists. Johannes Rydningen Lange recorded 7 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

964 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 TROMSØ STORM

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

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