

DIGITAL WORLD PULSE

ATP FINALS

PREDICTIONS 2026

NOVEMBER 15-22, 2026

SINGLES & DOUBLES | PRE-DRAW TOURNAMENT GUIDE

Inalpi Arena, Turin | Player analysis | US & Europe times

Independent guide | Research snapshot: November 3, 2026

CONTENTS

03	Singles programme: US and Europe	TIMES
04	Format and doubles start windows	FORMAT
05	Qualification and Race snapshot	FIELD
06	Alexander Zverev	SINGLES
07	Carlos Alcaraz	SINGLES
08	Daniil Medvedev	SINGLES
09	Ben Shelton	SINGLES
10	Cobolli and Fils	CHASE
11	Tiafoe and Jodar	CHASE
12	De Minaur and Djokovic	CHASE
13	Conditional matchup previews	TACTICS
14	Doubles contenders and title lean	DOUBLES
15	Round-robin ties: a worked example	RULES
16	Tournament predictions at a glance	PICKS
17	Ranking points and 2026 prize money	REWARDS
18	What to watch through the week	STAGES
19	Viewing and the final draw update	VIEWING
20	Sources and editorial disclaimer	REFS

8 singles entrants + 8 doubles teams | 15 matches in each discipline

Confirmed players and conditional contenders are labelled throughout.

CET for Turin | GMT for the UK | EST / PST for the US

Sources: [1] [2] [3] [4] [14]

SINGLES PROGRAMME


ALL TIMES ARE NOT BEFORE | OPPONENTS FOLLOW THE DRAW

NOVEMBER	STAGE	CET / TURIN	GMT / UK	EST / US EAST	PST / US WEST
SUN 15	RR DAY	14:00 CET	13:00 GMT	08:00 EST	05:00 PST
SUN 15	RR EVE	20:30 CET	19:30 GMT	14:30 EST	11:30 PST
MON 16	RR DAY	14:00 CET	13:00 GMT	08:00 EST	05:00 PST
MON 16	RR EVE	20:30 CET	19:30 GMT	14:30 EST	11:30 PST
TUE 17	RR DAY	14:00 CET	13:00 GMT	08:00 EST	05:00 PST
TUE 17	RR EVE	20:30 CET	19:30 GMT	14:30 EST	11:30 PST
WED 18	RR DAY	14:00 CET	13:00 GMT	08:00 EST	05:00 PST
WED 18	RR EVE	20:30 CET	19:30 GMT	14:30 EST	11:30 PST
THU 19	RR DAY	14:00 CET	13:00 GMT	08:00 EST	05:00 PST
THU 19	RR EVE	20:30 CET	19:30 GMT	14:30 EST	11:30 PST
FRI 20	RR DAY	14:00 CET	13:00 GMT	08:00 EST	05:00 PST
FRI 20	RR EVE	20:30 CET	19:30 GMT	14:30 EST	11:30 PST
SAT 21	SF DAY	14:30 CET	13:30 GMT	08:30 EST	05:30 PST
SAT 21	SF EVE	20:30 CET	19:30 GMT	14:30 EST	11:30 PST
SUN 22	FINAL	18:00 CET	17:00 GMT	12:00 EST	09:00 PST

READ THE TIMES WITH THE PROGRAMME

Every singles time above is a published NOT-BEFORE time. Earlier doubles matches can delay play. RR = round robin; SF = semi-final. All four clocks share the date shown in each row. Names and group assignments follow the official draw and daily order of play.

Sources: [2]



FORMAT & DOUBLES

DOUBLES START WINDOWS | SINGLES NOT-BEFORE TIMES ON PAGE 3

NOVEMBER / SESSION	CET / TURIN	GMT / UK	EST / US EAST	PST / US WEST
15-20 | RR DAY	11:30 CET	10:30 GMT	05:30 EST	02:30 PST
15-20 | RR EVE	18:00 CET	17:00 GMT	12:00 EST	09:00 PST
21 | SF DAY	12:00 CET	11:00 GMT	06:00 EST	03:00 PST
21 | SF EVE	18:00 CET	17:00 GMT	12:00 EST	09:00 PST
22 | FINAL	15:00 CET	14:00 GMT	09:00 EST	06:00 PST

EIGHT ENTRANTS, TWO GROUPS, TWO SEMI-FINALS

The event is played on indoor hard court. Singles and doubles each have two groups of four. Every entrant meets the other three in its group, with the top two advancing. The group winner then meets the runner-up from the other group. Singles uses best-of-three tie-break sets throughout, including the final. Doubles uses no-ad scoring; at one set each, a match tie-break replaces a full deciding set.

WHY THERE ARE 30 MATCHES

A four-entrant group produces six different pairings. Two groups therefore give twelve round-robin matches per discipline, followed by two semi-finals and one final: fifteen singles matches and fifteen doubles matches. The doubles windows above begin the sessions; singles has its own not-before times on page 3. The final field and the draw are needed before those slots can be assigned named opponents.

Sources: [1] [2] [3] [23]

QUALIFICATION SNAPSHOT

RACE POINTS: NOVEMBER 2 | ENTRY LABELS CHECKED NOVEMBER 3

RACE	PLAYER	POINTS	ENTRY STATUS
1	Alexander Zverev	9,350	QUALIFIED
2	Jannik Sinner	7,950	OUT
3	Carlos Alcaraz	5,110	QUALIFIED
4	Ben Shelton	4,530	QUALIFIED
5	Daniil Medvedev	3,820	QUALIFIED
6	Flavio Cobolli	3,690	CHASING
7	Arthur Fils	3,535	CHASING
8	Frances Tiafoe	3,390	CHASING
9	Rafael Jodar	3,194	CHASING
10	Alex de Minaur	3,170	CHASING

FOUR CONFIRMED SINGLES PLAYERS; FOUR PLACES STILL OPEN

The table reproduces the dated November 2 report after Basel and Vienna. Points can change during Paris, so use the report date when comparing it with a live page. The November 3 confirmed-player list contains Zverev, Alcaraz, Shelton and Medvedev. Sinner is unavailable through injury. Four singles places remain to be resolved in the cited Race report; the chasing profiles in this guide are selected contenders, not confirmed entrants or an exhaustive elimination list.

Sinner is unavailable and is excluded from all title selections.

Sources: [4] [5]



ALEXANDER ZVEREV

QUALIFIED | PRIMARY TITLE PICK

THE CASE FOR THE LEADING PICK

Zverev combines two previous ATP Finals titles with the strongest position in the dated Race snapshot. His 2026 Roland Garros and US Open victories add evidence that he can finish the biggest assignments. Those results support a leading title lean, while leaving the practical question of how his game translates to this particular indoor week.

THE FIRST TWO SHOTS MATTER

My tactical preference starts with serve placement and the position of the next ball. Zverev should benefit most when a strong delivery produces a manageable first groundstroke, rather than merely a spectacular ace count. I would watch whether he protects his court position after serving and makes the opponent defend before the rally becomes a neutral exchange.

RETURN PRESSURE WITHOUT FORCING THE FINISH

Against a powerful server, a deep blocked return can be more valuable than an attempted outright winner. The next task is to keep the ball away from an easy attacking forehand. My title case strengthens if Zverev can create repeatable pressure across several return games instead of depending on one loose service game from his opponent.

WHAT WOULD LOWER THE LEAN

A difficult group, short returns that give opponents the first attack, or repeated second-serve pressure would narrow the advantage. His recent defeat by De Minaur in Vienna is a useful reminder that the Race lead does not settle an individual matchup. Moderate confidence describes an editorial preference, not a measured chance of winning five matches or a guarantee of the trophy.

Title lean: Zverev | Confidence: Moderate before the draw

Sources: [4] [5] [6] [22]



CARLOS ALCARAZ

QUALIFIED | MAIN CHALLENGER

WHY HE CAN WIN THE TOURNAMENT

Alcaraz reached the 2025 final and completed his Career Grand Slam at the 2026 Australian Open. His qualification is confirmed. I view him as the main challenger because he can change the questions an opponent faces within the same service game, moving from baseline pressure to a shorter ball or a forward transition.

VARIETY NEEDS THE RIGHT STARTING POSITION

The useful version of variety begins after a balanced first attack. A drop shot from a strong court position asks a different question from one attempted while retreating. I would watch whether Alcaraz earns the shorter ball with depth and width, then follows forward with a clear recovery plan. Surprise alone does not make an attacking choice efficient.

MAKE THE RETURN GAME SUSTAINABLE

Against the biggest servers, the priority may be to put enough returns into play to create a second decision. An early missed chance should not force a more ambitious swing on every later point. The title case becomes stronger when his return position and backswing fit the delivery he is actually facing, rather than an assumed description of indoor conditions.

THE UNCERTAINTY TO RESPECT

Alcaraz returned from a wrist injury earlier in the season, but that history does not establish his condition in Turin. The immediate assessment should come from current reporting and the quality of his play. A group that repeatedly denies him a comfortable first attack would make his route harder, even if his best individual passages remain among the strongest in the field.

Outlook: strongest challenger to the primary pick

Sources: [4] [5] [7]



DANIIL MEDVEDEV

QUALIFIED | ALTERNATIVE TITLE THREAT

A RETURN WITH SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

The 2020 champion is back after missing the 2025 edition. His qualification report records four titles in 2026, including Dubai and Almaty, and a Masters 1000 final at Indian Wells. That is a stronger foundation than treating him solely as a former champion whose best case depends on old memories.

TURN THE RETURN INTO A REAL RALLY

My Medvedev case begins with what happens after the serve comes back. A return that lands short can invite another straightforward attack even when the first delivery was neutralised. I would watch his depth, the space he gives up and whether the opponent can move forward without taking much risk. Successful defense should make the next attacking choice harder.

USE PLACEMENT TO PROTECT SERVICE GAMES

A title challenge also needs service games that do not become repeated recovery exercises. I would look for variation in direction and a first groundstroke that keeps him from defending immediately. Against a player who steps inside the baseline, holding a familiar serving pattern too long may allow that opponent to read the next point before it develops.

WHY HE IS AN ALTERNATIVE PICK

Medvedev can make the favorite uncomfortable if he repeatedly extends neutral exchanges and changes the return problem. That does not make every indoor matchup favorable. Opponents who combine strong serving with reliable finishing positions can limit his chances to impose a rally. Until the group and current form are clearer, I place him behind Zverev and Alcaraz in the title preference.

Outlook: credible alternative winner | Confidence: Low

Sources: [4] [9]



BEN SHELTON

QUALIFIED | HIGH-IMPACT UPSET THREAT

A SERVE THAT CAN CHANGE A SHORT MATCH

Shelton has qualified for a second consecutive appearance after a season that includes the US Open final and four titles in his qualification report. His left-handed delivery gives opponents a distinct problem. The key question is whether he can turn those initial advantages into a repeatable plan over several different matchups in the same week.

WATCH THE SHOT AFTER THE BIG DELIVERY

An effective serve does not always produce a clean finishing ball. I would watch Shelton's balance on the first groundstroke and whether he leaves an avoidable passing lane after coming forward. The strongest version of his attacking game asks the opponent to make a difficult response twice; the weaker version offers a free recovery after the first defensive return.

BUILD A RETURN CHANCE BEFORE THE TIE-BREAK

The return game is central to the upset case. A few more neutral starts can reduce how often he needs to solve an entire set through a handful of tie-break points. I would value a balanced return position and useful depth more than a single highlight winner that is followed by several quick misses.

WHY ONE UPSET IS NOT THE WHOLE FORECAST

Zverev beat Shelton in the US Open final, but that outdoor best-of-five result is context rather than a script for an indoor best-of-three meeting. Shelton can threaten a leading contender without becoming my primary tournament pick. A title route requires repeated solutions after opponents adjust to his preferred serving patterns and to the positions he wants on the next ball.

Outlook: dangerous in an individual match | Title confidence: Low

Sources: [4] [8] [22]

COBOLLI & FILS

CHASING QUALIFICATION | ALL TURIN OUTLOOKS ARE CONDITIONAL

Flavio Cobolli

ENTRY NOT YET CONFIRMED

Cobolli is chasing a first ATP Finals appearance. His season includes the Roland Garros final, a Wimbledon quarter-final and the Cincinnati semi-finals, according to the official feature. That breadth is a reason to take his candidacy seriously across surfaces, while keeping qualification separate from the tactical outlook. If he reaches Turin, I would watch how he starts return points against the strongest servers. A deep, balanced response would help him use the next rally; short contact would let the opponent attack before he establishes a position. Home support can add energy, but it cannot supply a reliable return or resolve a difficult matchup. My conditional outlook is that he can trouble a contender without needing the whole match to become a spectacular hitting contest.

Watch: Return depth after a difficult first serve, then the quality of his next recovery.

Arthur Fils

ENTRY NOT YET CONFIRMED

Fils won Cincinnati by beating Tiafoe in a three-set final, having also defeated Cobolli earlier in that event. His forehand gives my conditional dark-horse case a concrete attacking foundation. I would watch whether he creates space for that shot without surrendering too much court on the preceding ball. The November 2 report also records his Basel retirement with a back issue and his subsequent statement that he was fit for Paris. Those are dated updates, not a medical forecast for Turin. If he qualifies and arrives ready to compete, his chance of disrupting a group depends on repeatable court position and serve protection rather than simply hitting harder than the opponent. Current reporting and the draw would materially affect the lean.

Watch: Whether the attacking forehand follows a stable setup rather than a hurried recovery.

Sources: [5] [10] [11]



TIAFOE & JODAR

CHASING QUALIFICATION | ALL TURIN OUTLOOKS ARE CONDITIONAL

Frances Tiafoe

ENTRY NOT YET CONFIRMED

Tiafoe's Cincinnati final provides a useful reference point for the level he can reach against strong opposition. He remains a qualification contender in the dated Race report. If he earns a Turin place, I would focus on the reliability of his first attacking choice. A well-placed serve and a balanced next ball can create an opportunity to move forward; an improvised finish from a poor position can return the initiative immediately. His response to a lost service game would also matter. One expensive passage does not require a more ambitious shot on every subsequent point. My conditional outlook is that he can upset a leading name when his attacking decisions stay connected, while a title prediction would require more evidence across the entire group.

Watch: The quality of the approach shot and recovery, rather than the appeal of a single volley.

Rafael Jodar

ENTRY NOT YET CONFIRMED

Jodar is pursuing qualification during a breakthrough season. His official Roland-Garros profile describes a powerful forehand and a game built through junior, college and Challenger competition. If he reaches Turin, the interesting test will be how those tools respond to opponents who repeatedly deny a comfortable strike. I would watch the depth of his first neutral ball and whether he can hold a useful court position after returning a strong serve. A young player's progress should be assessed through the actual exchanges, not an assumption that inexperience must produce a slow start. My conditional outlook is more cautious than for the established title candidates: the opportunity is to build competitive patterns against this field before assuming a run through the knockout stage.

Watch: How he handles two difficult points in sequence without giving away his next starting position.

Sources: [5] [11] [12]

THE PURSUIT CONTINUES

CHASING QUALIFICATION | ALL TURIN OUTLOOKS ARE CONDITIONAL

Alex de Minaur

ENTRY NOT YET CONFIRMED

De Minaur reached the Vienna final after beating Zverev in the semi-finals, according to the November 2 Race report. He is still chasing qualification, so this is a conditional Turin assessment. The tactical attraction is whether he can turn movement and early contact into pressure that survives a bigger opponent's next attack. I would watch the first ball after a defensive recovery: merely reaching it is different from landing it deep enough to prevent another easy strike. Against a powerful server, small improvements in return quality can create more useful neutral points. The Vienna result supports taking his challenge seriously, while the tournament field and current playing load still need to be established before projecting a specific group finish.

Watch: Whether a defensive recovery changes the point or simply delays the next attack.

Novak Djokovic

ENTRY NOT YET CONFIRMED

Djokovic's seven ATP Finals titles are relevant experience, but his 2026 qualification remains unresolved in this snapshot. The official October Race report records his Beijing title run through Zverev, Medvedev and De Minaur. If he earns a place and competes in Turin, I would assess return contact, serving patterns and the quality of his movement before assigning a title tier. Experience can help identify a repeated pattern; it does not make each current physical or tactical question disappear. His route would become more interesting if he can neutralise a strong serve without leaving a short reply and protect his own second serve under pressure. The appropriate forecast remains conditional on entry and fresh evidence from the final stretch of the season.

Watch: Return depth and efficient movement during repeated points, rather than reputation alone.

Sources: [5] [13]

MATCHUP BLUEPRINTS

HYPOTHETICAL ONLY | THESE ARE NOT ANNOUNCED FIXTURES

IF THEY MEET: ZVEREV vs ALCARAZ

My narrow illustrative lean is Zverev. His route is to keep the first serve and next groundstroke connected so Alcaraz has fewer comfortable opportunities to change the geometry of the point. Alcaraz can reverse the preference if his returns repeatedly create neutral starts and his variety follows a useful court position. I would not prescribe a set score before seeing the draw and current form. This conditional match lean has lower confidence than the broader title preference.

IF THEY MEET: MEDVEDEV vs SHELTON

My low-confidence illustrative lean is Medvedev if his return depth takes away a routine first-strike finish. Shelton's route is to keep that return uncomfortable and avoid allowing a defensive reply to become a settled rally. A high ace count alone would not resolve the matchup; I would also track the points that begin with a second serve and whether either player creates pressure on more than one return game per set.

IF BOTH QUALIFY AND MEET: COBOLLI vs FILS

I give Fils a small conditional lean when his attacking forehand follows a stable setup. Cobolli can change the reading by making the first attack difficult, returning with depth and forcing one more well-balanced strike. Their Cincinnati meeting is historical context, not a result to copy into a new setting. Neither player's appearance in this example assigns him a place in Turin, a group or a scheduled match.

Sources: [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11]



DOUBLES CONTENDERS

FIVE CONFIRMED TEAMS | THREE PLACES STILL TO BE RESOLVED

Harri Heliovaara / Henry Patten

The defending champions qualified first after winning Wimbledon. My leading doubles pick rests on their established partnership and ability to connect the serve, first volley and partner's movement. Watch the quality of the next contact, not just net position.

Christian Harrison / Neal Skupski

Australian Open and US Open titles make them a substantial challenge in their first season together. I would watch their communication on return points and whether both players react to the same planned opening rather than chase separate opportunities.

Marcel Granollers / Horacio Zeballos

A seventh consecutive qualification and the 2026 Roland Garros title provide meaningful experience. The tactical question is how effectively they protect the second serve and prevent a returner from directing the next exchange away from their preferred net pattern.

Marcelo Arevalo / Mate Pavic

The 2024 finalists return for a third consecutive appearance together. Their current season includes the Queen's Club title. I would assess how safely the first volley is played when the return lands low, before assuming a comfortable attacking finish.

Simone Bolelli / Andrea Vavassori

The Italian team has qualified again after winning Rotterdam, Miami and Rome this season. Home support adds atmosphere; the more useful evidence is the first return and their response at deciding points. Five teams are confirmed in this snapshot; three places remain open.

Editorial title lean: Heliovaara / Patten. Confidence: Moderate before the draw. Harrison / Skupski are my main alternative. A short match tie-break makes individual results particularly sensitive to a few points.

Sources: [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19]

ROUND-ROBIN TIES

A FICTIONAL WORKED EXAMPLE | ALL FOUR PLAYERS COMPLETE THREE MATCHES

This fictional group uses Players A-D to show why two round-robin wins do not always secure a semi-final place. Each player completes all three matches. These are teaching examples, not the 2026 draw or predicted results.

PLAYER	MATCH W-L	SETS W-L	SETS WON	PLACE
A	2-1	5-2	71.43%	1
B	2-1	4-2	66.67%	2
C	2-1	4-3	57.14%	3
D	0-3	0-6	0.00%	4

THE CALCULATION

A, B and C all finish 2-1. Their set percentages separate them: A wins 5 of 7 sets, B wins 4 of 6 and C wins 4 of 7. A and B advance. C has beaten A in this example, but a three-way tie is not settled by treating that one head-to-head result as decisive.

WHEN HEAD-TO-HEAD COMES BACK

The official sequence starts with match wins and matches played. A tie involving only two players uses their meeting. In a three-player tie, set percentage and then game percentage can matter; once one player is separated and only two remain tied, their head-to-head decides that remaining tie. Incomplete schedules and withdrawals require the full official procedure.

Sources: [3]

TOURNAMENT PREDICTIONS

PRE-DRAW EDITORIAL ORDER | GROUP POSITIONS ARE NOT ASSIGNED

ROLE	SELECTION	CONFIDENCE
Primary singles title pick	**Alexander Zverev**	Moderate
Main singles challenger	**Carlos Alcaraz**	Moderate
Alternative singles winner	**Daniil Medvedev**	Low
Individual-match upset threat	**Ben Shelton**	Low
Dark horse, if qualified	**Arthur Fils**	Low
Primary doubles title pick	**Heliovaara / Patten**	Moderate

WHAT THE TITLE PREFERENCE MEANS

Zverev is my first selection among the known candidates, supported by his major titles this season, previous Finals success and the tactical case on page 6. Alcaraz is the closest challenger in this editorial order. This is a preference among contenders, not a declaration that the two will meet in the final.

WHY THE DRAW CAN CHANGE THE READING

A title route depends on the actual group, its order of play and the players who complete qualification. Three attractive names can create very different problems from one another. The four confirmed singles players listed here are not a predicted set of four semi-finalists. Conditional candidates must first earn and retain a place.

CONFIDENCE WITHOUT FALSE PRECISION

Moderate describes a clearer editorial preference with credible counterarguments. Low describes a narrower lean or greater uncertainty. Neither is a numerical probability. No live odds, invented model percentages, future match results or preassigned group positions are used to make this forecast appear more certain than the evidence allows.

Sources: [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [11] [14] [15]

POINTS & PRIZE MONEY

PUBLISHED 2026 AWARDS | US DOLLARS | DOUBLES PRIZES ARE PER TEAM

AWARD	SINGLES	DOUBLES / TEAM
Participation: 3 group matches	$338,000	$134,200
Each round-robin win	$405,000	$96,600
Semi-final win	$1,206,000	$178,500
Final win	$2,412,000	$356,800
Undefeated champion total	$5,171,000	$959,300

RANKING POINTS: SINGLES AND DOUBLES

Each round-robin win	**200**
Semi-final win	**400**
Final win	**500**
Undefeated champion	**1,500**

All prize figures are US dollars. Doubles amounts are per team. The participation fee shown assumes three group matches; the official schedule has lower amounts for one or two appearances. The undefeated total includes participation and all match-win payments, so it should not be added again to those rows. An unbeaten champion earns 3 x 200 + 400 + 500 = 1,500 ranking points; a champion with a 2-1 group record earns 1,300. Check the linked 2026 schedule for participation and alternate provisions.

Sources: [21]



WHAT TO WATCH

FOLLOW THE PATTERNS THROUGH THE WEEK

OPENING MATCH: IDENTIFY THE REPEATABLE PATTERN

The first task is to discover how points are being started. Track serve direction, return depth and the first neutral ball. A player can win a spectacular opening set while leaving a recurring weakness in the same second-serve pattern. The useful question is whether the opponent has a practical adjustment available for the next set.

SECOND MATCH: WATCH THE RESPONSE TO ADJUSTMENT

Once opponents have seen a Turin match, familiar patterns become easier to anticipate. A successful contender should be able to change placement or starting position without abandoning the strengths that created the first win. Distinguish a few missed aggressive shots from a structural problem that appears whenever the rally begins in the same way.

FINAL GROUP MATCH: CHECK THE WHOLE TABLE

Keep match wins, completed matches, sets and games available together. A simple two-win headline can conceal a three-player tie. Read the qualification scenario before drawing conclusions from a player needing one more set. Competitive effort can still be meaningful when an entrant's path is narrow, but the table must be calculated from actual results.

KNOCKOUT WEEKEND: UPDATE THE MATCHUP

A semi-final or final is a new contest even when the players met earlier in the week. Revisit the serve-return pattern, the quality of recovery between points and what each side changed. Use current observation and reporting to assess the matchup. Do not infer a precise physical problem from a single tired-looking movement or one long service game.

Sources: [2] [3]

VIEWING & DRAW UPDATE

UNITED STATES AND SELECTED EUROPEAN BROADCASTER LISTINGS

MARKET	OFFICIAL LISTED BROADCASTER
United States	Tennis Channel
United Kingdom	Sky UK
France	Eurosport France
Germany	Sky Deutschland
Italy	Sky Italia / Mediaset
Spain	Telefonica / Movistar

BEFORE NAMING THE FIRST MATCH

Confirm the remaining entrants, the group draw, any replacements and the daily order of play. Keep the official opponent pairing separate from the conditional examples on page 13. Singles times are not-before times and can move later when doubles runs long. The full programme on page 3 converts CET into GMT, EST and PST without assuming a fixed match duration.

FOLLOW THE CURRENT RIGHTS HOLDER

The table summarises the official broadcaster listing for the US and selected European markets. Check the provider's event guide for the specific channel or subscription access. The tournament also links to Tennis TV for live and on-demand ATP coverage; local availability should be checked there. Research is dated November 3, with the Race table deliberately frozen to the November 2 report.

Sources: [2] [4] [5] [14] [20]

SOURCES & DISCLAIMER

CLICK THE REFERENCES TO OPEN THE OFFICIAL PAGES

[01] Tournament overview
[02] 2026 tournament schedule
[03] Rules and round-robin tie-breaks
[04] Confirmed singles players
[05] Race report: November 2, 2026
[06] Zverev: official player profile
[07] Alcaraz: qualification report
[08] Shelton: qualification report
[09] Medvedev: qualification report
[10] Cobolli: the pursuit of Turin
[11] Fils vs Tiafoe: Cincinnati final
[12] Jodar: Roland-Garros player profile
[13] Djokovic: Beijing title and Race
[14] Confirmed doubles teams
[15] Heliovaara/Patten: qualification
[16] Harrison/Skupski: qualification
[17] Granollers/Zeballos: qualification
[18] Arevalo/Pavic: qualification
[19] Bolelli/Vavassori: qualification
[20] Official broadcaster listings
[21] 2026 points and prize money
[22] Zverev vs Shelton: US Open final
[23] ATP calendar: indoor hard court

DATES, QUALIFICATION & CLOCKS

Researched November 3, 2026. The Race table uses the November 2 ATP report; qualification labels use the official entrant lists checked November 3. Remaining places, seeds, groups and named matches are not assumed. Published singles starts are not-before times. CET is UTC+1, GMT UTC+0, EST UTC-5 and PST UTC-8; each programme row keeps its own calendar date. Recheck the official draw and daily order of play.

EDITORIAL NOTE

Digital World Pulse is an independent publisher, unaffiliated with ATP, the event or broadcasters. Tactical reads and selections are original editorial opinions, not results, guarantees or statistical win probabilities. Conditional matchups are examples rather than scheduled fixtures. No betting odds or medical diagnosis is supplied. Conceptual AI-created scenes show anonymous athletes and equipment, not the named players or documentary event photographs. Conditions, fields and viewing arrangements may change.