

MIR Comparison Report

Two Players · Side-by-Side · 4-Page Professional Detailed Report

HEAD-TO-HEAD COMPARISON

Player A: Jalen Carter

Wing · Sample Senior · Mid-Major D1

MIR: 83 · TIER A

Player B: Devon Brooks

Wing · Sample Senior · Mid-Major D1

MIR: 82 · TIER A

THE VERDICT

Two wings within one MIR point of each other on the composite — but completely different player profiles underneath. Carter is the physical anchor: rebounding, defense, durability. Brooks is the playmaker: pace, impact, ball security. Same surface number, very different basketball.

Side-by-Side Component Scorecard

PLAYER A · CARTER

PLAYER B · BROOKS

#	COMPONENT	SCORE	PERCENTILE	#	COMPONENT	SCORE	PERCENTILE	PRO
01	Score	86	91th	01	Score	82	87th	High
02	Impact	78	83th	02	Impact	88	93th	High
03	Rebound	88	93th	03	Rebound	70	75th	Solid
04	Defense	84	89th	04	Defense	80	85th	High
05	Clutch	79	84th	05	Clutch	86	91th	High
06	Tempo	82	87th	06	Tempo	90	95th	Elite
07	Ball Security	76	81th	07	Ball Security	84	89th	High
08	Durability	88	93th	08	Durability	76	81th	Solid

Component Delta Analysis

Where each player wins, where each player loses, and where the gap is significant enough to matter for your decision.

COMPONENT	PLAYER A	PLAYER B	DELTA	WINNER
01 · Score	86	82	+4	Player A
02 · Impact	78	88	-10	Player B
03 · Rebound	88	70	+18	Player A
04 · Defense	84	80	+4	Player A
05 · Clutch	79	86	-7	Player B
06 · Tempo	82	90	-8	Player B
07 · Ball Security	76	84	-8	Player B
08 · Durability	88	76	+12	Player A

KEY DELTAS

Rebound (+18 for Carter): Significant. Carter's defensive rebound rate is in the 88th percentile for wings; Brooks is in the 32nd. If you're recruiting for a frontcourt-light roster, this gap alone decides the call.

Impact (+10 for Brooks): Brooks creates for others at a rate that's hard to ignore. Assist rate 82nd percentile, deflections per 40 in the 80s. If your offense needs a connector, Brooks is the answer.

Durability (+12 for Carter): Carter has missed only 3 games across his college career; Brooks has missed 11. For a high-investment portal transfer at this level, that's worth quantifying.

System Fit Analysis

PLAYER A · CARTER — IDEAL FIT

Half-court grinder system. Defense-first program. Rebounding-by-committee scheme. Coaches who value durability and physical anchors will value Carter. Examples of stylistic fit: low-tempo Big Ten programs, ACC defensive-oriented staffs, mid-major programs needing veteran stability.

PLAYER B · BROOKS — IDEAL FIT

Up-tempo offense. Pass-heavy system. Programs comfortable with a wing handling the ball in transition. Brooks' Tempo (90) and Impact (88) make him a natural fit in fast-break-oriented schemes. Examples of stylistic fit: Big 12 offenses, transition-heavy WCC programs, NCAA Tournament-style up-tempo staffs.

Risk Profile

Carter risk: Lower Impact and Ball Security components suggest he's not the player to put the ball in his hands in late-game situations. His Clutch grade reflects this — 79 is solid, not elite.

Brooks risk: Durability (76) is the weakest link. Eleven missed games is a pattern to investigate. Lower Rebound score limits his utility in frontcourt-thin lineups.

SAMPLE
NOT A REAL EVALUATION

The Matchup Verdict

"Both players are Tier A. Both are immediate-impact transfers. The decision is system-driven, not talent-driven. If your program runs a half-court, defense-first style — take Carter. Period. His Rebound, Durability, and Defense package is what wins games in March in a grind-it-out system. If your program runs up-tempo and needs a connector — take Brooks. His Tempo and Impact components fit that style perfectly. The Engine's recommendation is that this is one of the cleanest 'system fit' decisions of the cycle. Both staffs should know exactly which type of player they're after. The data answers the question."

Tier Reference

MIR RANGE	TIER	CLASSIFICATION
90–100	Tier S	Elite · Lottery-Projection Caliber
80–89	Tier A	High-Major · All-Conference Caliber
70–79	Tier B	Mid-Major Starter · High-Major Rotation
60–69	Tier C	Rotation Player
Below 60	Tier D	Developmental · Project Player

Methodology Note

The MIR Comparison Report runs both players through the same proprietary 8-component scoring methodology. Position-adjusted. Pace-adjusted. Component delta analysis identifies meaningful gaps (typically ± 7 points or more). All data traces to verified box-score and play-by-play sources.

This is a SAMPLE report. All player names, statistics, and verdicts are illustrative only. For a real MIR Comparison Report, contact info@themirrorreport.com or visit themirrorreport.com.