Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología, Conocimiento e Innovación

ANNUAL REPORT

PEER REVIEWERS' EVALUATION FORM

CENTER DIRECTOR'S LAST NAME	Miguel L. Allende Connelly
NAME OF THE INSTITUTE OR NUCLEUS	Millenium Institute Center for Genome Regulation
REVIEWER'S LAST NAME	
PERIOD EVALUATED	**2024**

EVALUATION SCALE AND CRITERIA

After reading the proposal, please use the following grading scale to complete your evaluation:

GRADE EQUIVALENTS You can score between 0 to 5 points, decimal places are allowed. *(e.g.: GRADE 2,5)*		
Excellent	The proposal meets/addresses outstandingly all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any weaknesses are minor.	**5,0 points**
Very Good	The proposal meets/addresses the aspects of the criterion very well, although some improvements are possible.	**4,0 to 4,9 points**
Good	The proposal meets/addresses the aspects of the criterion in a good way, although it requires some improvements.	**3,0 to 3,9 points**
Regular	The proposal generally meets/addresses aspects of the criterion, but there are significant shortcomings.	**2,0 to 2,9 points**
Deficient	The proposal doesn´t meet/addresses aspects of the criterion or there are serious inherent deficiencies.	**1,0 to 1,9 points**
Doesn´t qualify	The proposal doesn´t meet/addresses the criterion under analysis or cannot be evaluated due to missing or incomplete information.	**0,0 to 0,9 points**

- **For any criterion or sub-criterion to be graded, you can write any number between 0 and 5, where 5 is the highest score and 0 the lowest *(e.g. 3,5)*.**
- Always Include comments for each criterion.

COMPONENT 1: ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Evaluate the scientific, technical, and methodological achievements of the center, including the excellence and impact of the work developed and the productivity demonstrated. Consider the level of fulfillment of the Center's objectives during the period, evidenced through scientific and technological results such as:

- High-quality publications in indexed journals (WOS, Scopus, SciELO), books and book chapters.
- Cutting-edge research contributions at national and international levels.
- Multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and associative work among Principal Investigators and other team members.
- Results with societal, public sector, or private sector impact.
- Use of open science practices and data repositories (if applicable).

Additionally, if applicable, consider the adequacy of the Center's research plans, methodologies, team structure, and integrated management capacity in relation to the goals set. Base your evaluation on verifiable evidence provided in the annexes and summary tables.

SUB-COMPONENT 1.1:

- Consider whether the research questions or hypotheses are clearly stated; whether the methodologies and research techniques are appropriate and well described and whether there is alignment between planned work and executed research activities.
- Consider whether open science practices (e.g., use of open data repositories) are addressed.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The scientific advances of the Center and its impact are great. The scientific implementation of the objectives and the work programme are stated appropriately and executed along the anticipated path. The results achieved to date are internationally competitive and outstanding.

In last year's assessment, it was suggested that the Center should aim at even more coherence and overall direction of the projects pursued by the groups. Funnelling the work toward a "common theme" was recommended. The Center has reacted positively to this comment. In total, 41% of publications resulted from collaborative efforts among IM-CRG researchers, a significant increase from 25% in 2023. Also, "Network Projects" were initiated as a means of advancing collaboration. A special case is the "1000 Genomes Chile" activity, which could form a basis of even more

collaborative work within the Center but also with scientists beyond, something that has already started. The participants should pursue this direction further.

Aligning their research further toward an overall common theme could improve the importance and recognition of the results. Thereby, the Center could make a scientific mark internationally as a center; currently the work and the participating scientists are recognized at that level, which is an excellent start.

SUB-COMPONENT 1.2:

Comment on the collaborative and interdisciplinary work among the Center's researchers, including principal investigators, students and other team members. Evaluate how collaboration among team members occurs in pursuit of the Center's objectives.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

There was a noticeable increase in collaborative publications compared to 2023. Scientists with varying expertise have come together, advancing scientific output and its quality. It always takes a while until collaborative work translates into collaborative publications; the Center is on a very good way. Students and junior scientists have been involved in the publications, including papers on which they featured as first-authors. The Center should keep up its direction in this matter and foster collaboration and interaction between groups further.

SUB-COMPONENT 1.3: Evaluate the Center's productivity and impact, considering the following:

- Scientific publications, books, book chapters and others (quality and quantity of publications in high-impact journals.
- Scientific achievements as: scientific presentations, conferences, seminars, Organization of scientific events, intellectual property, editorial committees, scientific awards, among others.
- Impact of the knowledge generated by the Center on society and on the public or private sectors.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The Center's scientists have been very productive indeed. This clearly indicates the high value of MI-CGR. They have published 72 research articles with an average impact factor of 4.98 in peer-reviewed journals. This is a really impressive result and very good value for the money spent. In addition, there were two book contributions. Besides a great average impact, there have been highlight publications with high

impact, both scientifically but also societally. The Center has to be praised for this accomplishment.

Also, the number of scientific presentations is great. Several meetings and scientific events were organised and participants of the Center are acting on editorial boards of international journals, highlighting their standing internationally.

The Center has addressed the issue of patenting that was raised in the 2023 review. As a matter of fact, patents have been filed. It is correct that patenting is not an explicit issue of the Millenium Institutes. However, the institutes should provide value to society and patenting would certainly be a process, by which this could be achieved. Given that the Center has interactions with companies and industry and given that the three research lines are something that companies should be interested in, this aspect should be on the scientists' mind and actively pursued.

COMPONENT 1: ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
	4.9				

COMPONENT 2: TRAINING OF YOUNG RESEARCHERS

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

This section should be evaluated based on the Center's achievements and plans related to the training of young scientists and the development of advanced human capital. Please consider the participation of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as postdoctoral researchers, in the activities of the Center. Evaluate the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at promoting research leadership among early-career researchers, including their formal incorporation into academic or research institutions. Plans that explicitly address gender equity in these areas should be viewed positively.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.1: Comment on the Center's students and training, considering the following:

- Quantity and quality of students (undergraduate, MSc, PhD) and of postdocs with tutors belonging to the Center.
- Number of young people graduated during the period.
- Gender representation among the students.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

In 2024, there were 45 undergraduate students, 23 master students and 47 PhD students, of which 22 completed their theses. The gender balance is excellent, with variations going either way and always being within the limits that one could expect by an unbiased process. At a more advanced level, 9 young researchers and 25 postdoctoral scientists were involved. Altogether, the number of students and younger scientist is great.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.2:

Insert comments regarding the participation of the Center *(or of the Center's researchers)* in **formal training programs**, at different levels, for young scientist.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

As one would expect, since the PI scientists of the Center are active at universities, there is very good involvement and provision of formal training activities for younger scientists. The various activities cover a wide area of expertise.

One would hope – no specific information is provided – that the students and postdocs of the Center could take advantage of this wide variety of expertise of the Center's members, e.g. by exchanges between groups and institutions. This should be emphasized, if not already implemented.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.3: Comment on students' activities, considering the following:

- Analyze the main activities, congresses, forums, among others, carried out by the Center's students, focusing on their academic and scientific relevance.
- If applicable, evaluate the number, diversity, and relevance of internal and external internships.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

Of 114 oral presentations and posters, 42 were delivered by students and 17 by postdoctoral or young researchers (about 50%). This is a very good number. The Center is clearly aiming at and active in providing education and training across its participant institutions and groups.

Quite a few students were co-authors or even first-authors on the Center's publications, which is a positive achievement. One would expect that the percentage of papers, on which students are co-authors, is growing beyond the 26% in 2024 as authorship documents their real involvement in the Center's activities rather than being merely at the same institutions as the Center's PIs. This percentage is a hard measure for the Center's training activities at the level of master and PhD students as well as postdocs.

There have been two internships – one outgoing, one being hosted. As international experience and contacts will have great impact on students, the Center should try to improve on this number.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.4:

- Evaluate the center's main achievements in the field of training young scientists and identify challenges
- Indicate whether the center has academic or employment integration strategies (optional).

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

There is nothing to be added here, which has not been mentioned already in sections 2.1 to 2.3 above.

COMPONENT 2: TRAINING OF YOUNG RESEARCHERS

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
	4.8				

COMPONENT 3: NETWORKING

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Formal Collaboration Network Plan
Evaluate the Center's strategy and progress in creating formal collaboration networks at the national and international levels that promote advanced scientific development. Evaluate whether there is a clear plan, its objectives, and its alignment with the Center's scientific goals. Review the status of implementation and identified challenges.

SUB-COMPONENT 3.1:

Progress and adjustments in collaboration networks
Evaluate the Center's collaborative network plan, including the level of progress achieved in establishing and strengthening networks. Assess whether adjustments have been made to the original objectives and whether new challenges have arisen in the planning or implementation of these activities.

Main achievements of collaborative networks
Evaluate the main achievements, milestones, or products resulting from the Center's collaborative networks.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The number of formal collaboration networks increased from 5 in 2023 to 23 in 2024. The Center has to be applauded for this achievement. There are collaborations both nationally and internationally. In particular, the 1000 Genomes Chile project has to be mentioned as a great activity in this respect.

A slight remark of caution: While networking is important and usually beneficial to science, it should not become a purpose on itself but always serve a real scientific purpose. While grant agencies love collaboration (the more the better), this is not always true for real life science. The Center should resist any push for collaborations that are not necessary for scientific reasons.

SUB-COMPONENT 3.2:

Resource Leverage Strategies (if applicable)

Consider whether the center has implemented strategies to obtain complementary funding, whether public or private.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The Center has been very active and successful in obtaining supplementary funding, both public and private.

COMPONENT 3: NETWORKING

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
5.0					

COMPONENT 4: OUTREACH

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Evaluate this component taking into account the Center's plan and objectives for knowledge dissemination and Projection to the External Environment (PME). Analyze the consistency of this plan with the Center's objectives, its relevance, and originality. Evaluate the activities carried out, target audiences, channels used, and results obtained. Also consider the contributions and links established by the Center with other sectors of society.

SUB-COMPONENT 4.1:

- Consider the relevance and innovative aspects of the plan and/or dissemination strategies used, including the target audience and expected results.
- Evaluate the Center's main outreach activities.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The Center participated in 21 outreach activities across 5 of the country's 16 regions, with 10 of them organized by the Center. Through this, it engaged with nearly 4,500

people. Additionally, there were 40 appearances in the media. These are remarkable numbers. The Center should keep up this effort, although it may admittedly put some kind of time pressure on the scientific activities. Still, information of and support by the public are essential for future work, also in terms of future funding to MI-CGR beyond the current funding phase.

SUB-COMPONENT 4.2:

Evaluate the Center's connections with other sectors, including initiatives in the productive, public, social, cultural, educational spheres, and NGOs, considering both quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

There are long-standing connections with the productive sector, in particular with representatives from the agriculture and aquaculture industry. In 2024, the Center actively participated in establishing and strengthening connections with other sectors. There were 25 activities that included meetings, conferences and panel discussions. Also, private funding was secured. All this is great and should be continued.

The Center should actively pursue the issue of patenting together with industry partners or licensing out patents they have filed themselves. Although this is not explicitly an objective of MI centers, this reviewer considers it important. Also, this reviewer is aware of the fact that industry is frequently reluctant of joining such activity (or wish to have the information for free). Nevertheless, the Center should make (and document) an effort in this direction.

COMPONENT 4: OUTREACH

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
	4.8				

General Comments

Finally, enter general comments, suggestions, and recommendations about this Millennium Center.

Weaknesses: (enter at least one justification; no character limit)

The MI CGR is a very strong activity indeed and continuously improving during the last few reporting periods; there are no real weaknesses. Still, there is always room for improvement at various levels, of course, as outlined in the above paragraphs. In particular focussing on a common scientific theme would foster the Center's quality even further and make it visible internationally as a Center rather than a group of very strong scientists.

Strengths:(enter at least one justification; no character limit)

The Center is a very good partnership with a sound basis and plenty of inspirations and initiatives. The research lines complement each other nicely and will produce more and more added value by interaction between them and with other collaborating partners.

Final comments: (enter at least one justification; no character limit)

An excellent activity! With several years to go, it will develop further as a Center and improve beyond the already very high standard. One can expect this to happen during the entire course of the funding period.

Approval of the Annual Report
(Required Section)

Based on your knowledge and the evaluation carried out, considering all the above criteria, we kindly ask you to classify this center's annual report according to the following:

Annual Report Approved: the center is considered to have adequately achieved its goals during the evaluated year.

Annual Report Observed: improvements are considered to be implemented for the center to achieve its proposed goals during the evaluated year.

*Please justify only observed reports

Annual Report Approved	X	**Annual Report Observed**	

ANNUAL REPORT

PEER REVIEWERS' EVALUATION FORM

CENTER DIRECTOR'S LAST NAME	*Allende*
NAME OF THE INSTITUTE OR NUCLEUS	***Millenium Institute Center for Genome Regulation***
REVIEWER'S LAST NAME	
PERIOD EVALUATED	**2025**

EVALUATION SCALE AND CRITERIA

After reading the proposal, please use the following grading scale to complete your evaluation:

GRADE EQUIVALENTS You can score between 0 to 5 points, decimal places are allowed. *(e.g.: GRADE 2,5)*		
Excellent	The proposal meets/addresses outstandingly all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any weaknesses are minor.	**5,0 points**
Very Good	The proposal meets/addresses the aspects of the criterion very well, although some improvements are possible.	**4,0 to 4,9 points**
Good	The proposal meets/addresses the aspects of the criterion in a good way, although it requires some improvements.	**3,0 to 3,9 points**
Regular	The proposal generally meets/addresses aspects of the criterion, but there are significant shortcomings.	**2,0 to 2,9 points**
Deficient	The proposal doesn´t meet/addresses aspects of the criterion or there are serious inherent deficiencies.	**1,0 to 1,9 points**
Doesn´t qualify	The proposal doesn´t meet/addresses the criterion under analysis or cannot be evaluated due to missing or incomplete information.	**0,0 to 0,9 points**

- **For any criterion or sub-criterion to be graded, you can write any number between 0 and 5, where 5 is the highest score and 0 the lowest *(e.g. 3,5)*.**
- Always Include comments for each criterion.

COMPONENT 1: ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Evaluate the scientific, technical, and methodological achievements of the center, including the excellence and impact of the work developed and the productivity demonstrated. Consider the level of fulfillment of the Center's objectives during the period, evidenced through scientific and technological results such as:

- High-quality publications in indexed journals (WOS, Scopus, SciELO), books and book chapters.
- Cutting-edge research contributions at national and international levels.
- Multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and associative work among Principal Investigators and other team members.
- Results with societal, public sector, or private sector impact.
- Use of open science practices and data repositories (if applicable).

Additionally, if applicable, consider the adequacy of the Center's research plans, methodologies, team structure, and integrated management capacity in relation to the goals set. Base your evaluation on verifiable evidence provided in the annexes and summary tables.

SUB-COMPONENT 1.1:

- Consider whether the research questions or hypotheses are clearly stated; whether the methodologies and research techniques are appropriate and well described and whether there is alignment between planned work and executed research activities.
- Consider whether open science practices (e.g., use of open data repositories) are addressed.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The report clearly and consistently presents the research questions, demonstrating well-formulated hypotheses and strong alignment with the Institute's strategic objectives. The methodologies described are appropriate (validated by peer reviewed published paper; >70), up-to-date, and well justified, ensuring both the validity of the results and the reproducibility of the studies. There is a clear correspondence between the planned work and the activities carried out, reflecting effective management and achievement of goals.

SUB-COMPONENT 1.2:

Comment on the collaborative and interdisciplinary work among the Center's researchers, including principal investigators, students and other team members. Evaluate how collaboration among team members occurs in pursuit of the Center's objectives.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The Center demonstrates exemplary collaborative and interdisciplinary work across all levels of its organization. Principal investigators, students, and supporting team members engage actively in joint projects that integrate diverse expertise and methodologies. Collaboration is clearly embedded in the design and execution of research activities, fostering synergies that enhance both scientific output and training opportunities. Interactions between groups showed to be fluid and productive, allowing knowledge exchange and the development of innovative approaches aligned with the Center's objectives. This dynamic, team-oriented environment not only strengthens the research agenda but also I am convinced that ensures long-term capacity building and scientific leadership.

SUB-COMPONENT 1.3: Evaluate the Center's productivity and impact, considering the following:

- Scientific publications, books, book chapters and others (quality and quantity of publications in high-impact journals.
- Scientific achievements as: scientific presentations, conferences, seminars, Organization of scientific events, intellectual property, editorial committees, scientific awards, among others.
- Impact of the knowledge generated by the Center on society and on the public or private sectors.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The project had a great impact on several aspects in the scientific community, with several highly qualified peer reviewed journals, organizing several International Conference on Plant Biology (25 countries), International meetings, Symposia and Seminars (including public sector). Besides, the Center participated profusely in many national and international events including Congress with oral and poster presentations by young researchers. From the technological point of view, I trust in the near future data on biochemical mechanism on microbiome-plant interactions regulating fruit quality will deliver new technologies or agricultural practices to aid growers to lift some of the restrictions imposed by abiotic stress.

COMPONENT 1: ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
	4.8				

COMPONENT 2: TRAINING OF YOUNG RESEARCHERS

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

This section should be evaluated based on the Center's achievements and plans related to the training of young scientists and the development of advanced human capital. Please consider the participation of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as postdoctoral researchers, in the activities of the Center. Evaluate the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at promoting research leadership among early-career researchers, including their formal incorporation into academic or research institutions. Plans that explicitly address gender equity in these areas should be viewed positively.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.1: Comment on the Center's students and training, considering the following:

- Quantity and quality of students (undergraduate, MSc, PhD) and of postdocs with tutors belonging to the Center.
- Number of young people graduated during the period.
- Gender representation among the students.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The report showed outstanding achievement in this topic. Among others, 113 students were mentored with gender representation (54 women, 61 men), with 22 completing their theses. The vast majority of those who completed their theses went on to enroll in a Master or Doctoral program or began a postdoctoral project, while the others started working in industry.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.2:

Insert comments regarding the participation of the Center *(or of the Center's researchers)* in **formal training programs**, at different levels, for young scientist.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

This topic was highly achieved.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.3: Comment on students' activities, considering the following:

- Analyze the main activities, congresses, forums, among others, carried out by the Center's students, focusing on their academic and scientific relevance.
- If applicable, evaluate the number, diversity, and relevance of internal and external internships.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

Students took part in outreach activities across many countries and regions, 10 of which were organized by the Center. As a result, the Center engaged with nearly 4,500 individuals, mostly school students. Overall, The Center excels in achieving its objectives regarding student engagement in academic and scientific activities. Participation in congresses, forums, and other events is frequent and of high quality, providing valuable opportunities for visibility, networking, and knowledge dissemination. These activities not only highlight the relevance of the research but also contribute significantly to the professional development of students. Likewise, the diversity and scope of internal and external internships are commendable, offering training experiences that strengthen technical and interdisciplinary skills. Overall, the achievements in this area reflect a strong commitment to fostering the next generation of scientific leaders.

SUB-COMPONENT 2.4:

- Evaluate the center's main achievements in the field of training young scientists and identify challenges
- Indicate whether the center has academic or employment integration strategies (optional).

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The Center has achieved remarkable progress in training young scientists, offering comprehensive mentorship, formal teaching, and opportunities for research dissemination. Students and postdoctoral fellows play an active role in publications, frequently as co-authors and first authors, which strengthens their academic visibility and professional development. Participation in congresses, outreach, and collaborative networks further enhances their training. A significant achievement is the successful insertion of graduates into postgraduate programs and industry positions, supported by strong researcher connections.

COMPONENT 2: TRAINING OF YOUNG RESEARCHERS

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
5.0					

COMPONENT 3: NETWORKING

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Formal Collaboration Network Plan
Evaluate the Center's strategy and progress in creating formal collaboration networks at the national and international levels that promote advanced scientific development. Evaluate whether there is a clear plan, its objectives, and its alignment with the Center's scientific goals. Review the status of implementation and identified challenges.

SUB-COMPONENT 3.1:

Progress and adjustments in collaboration networks
Evaluate the Center's collaborative network plan, including the level of progress achieved in establishing and strengthening networks. Assess whether adjustments have been made to the original objectives and whether new challenges have arisen in the planning or implementation of these activities.

Main achievements of collaborative networks
Evaluate the main achievements, milestones, or products resulting from the Center's collaborative networks.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

During the evaluation period, the Center had a wide coverage of this point, with a strong focus on promoting technical scientific exchange at every level, which reinforces the institutional image and promotes inclusive scientific collaboration at the highest level in the subject it deals with. Therefore, this topic was very well covered, highlighting the inter-institutional connections.

SUB-COMPONENT 3.2:

Resource Leverage Strategies (if applicable)

Consider whether the center has implemented strategies to obtain complementary funding, whether public or private.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

During the analysis of the presented report, through the promotion of activities and exposure of scientific/technical results at all levels, the training of students and the international cooperation it has generated, the Center has promoted and obtained new fundings for the present and sustainable future financing for expanding its research.

COMPONENT 3: NETWORKING

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
5.0					

COMPONENT 4: OUTREACH

COMPONENT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Evaluate this component taking into account the Center's plan and objectives for knowledge dissemination and Projection to the External Environment (PME). Analyze the consistency of this plan with the Center's objectives, its relevance, and originality. Evaluate the activities carried out, target audiences, channels used, and results obtained. Also consider the contributions and links established by the Center with other sectors of society.

SUB-COMPONENT 4.1:

- Consider the relevance and innovative aspects of the plan and/or dissemination strategies used, including the target audience and expected results.
- Evaluate the Center's main outreach activities.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The Center's dissemination strategies are highly relevant and innovative, targeting diverse audiences through academic, professional, and public-oriented activities. Outreach efforts include participation in congresses, scientific meetings, and public forums, ensuring both visibility within the scientific community and broader societal engagement. Students and young researchers play an active role, strengthening the impact and sustainability of these initiatives. The integration of collaborative networks further amplifies dissemination, fostering knowledge exchange and interdisciplinary dialogue. Expected results, such as increased awareness of genomic research and strengthened links with stakeholders, are clearly aligned with the Center's mission, reflecting excellence in outreach and communication strategies.

SUB-COMPONENT 4.2:

Evaluate the Center's connections with other sectors, including initiatives in the productive, public, social, cultural, educational spheres, and NGOs, considering both quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

COMMENTS: (enter any type of pertinent comment you may have; try to be as detailed as possible; no character limit)

The Center demonstrates strong and expanding connections with multiple sectors, effectively bridging science with productive, public, social, and educational spheres. Collaborations with industry partners have enabled access to resources and advanced technologies, while partnerships with public institutions and NGOs support biodiversity conservation and sustainable development initiatives. Engagement in cultural and educational activities fosters public understanding of genomics and strengthens community ties. Quantitatively, the growth in collaborative networks and co-funded projects is significant, while qualitatively, these initiatives generate trust, visibility, and long-term impact. Overall, the Center's cross-sector engagement reflects a balanced strategy with both scientific and societal benefits.

COMPONENT 4: OUTREACH

GRADE ASSESSMENT: (Please score only one. The allocation of decimals is possible).

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn´t qualify
5.0					

General Comments

Finally, enter general comments, suggestions, and recommendations about this Millennium Center.

Weaknesses: (enter at least one justification; no character limit)

Few things to mention, just that part of the sustainability of training and professional insertion strategies for young scientists may depend to some extent on the personal networks and contacts of senior researchers, rather than on a formalized institutional plan. In the case of "the study of fruit quality traits in a changing environment" in future reports efforts on linking data on the biochemical findings with novel agricultural practices to improve pre and postharvest fruit quality would be highly appreciated.

Strengths:(enter at least one justification; no character limit)

The center is constantly growing at every level: training at the Institute, academic and scientific results, international integration, science promotion, and showing the relevance of evolutionary genomics for regional natural resource conservation. This is all part of the process of establishing the center as a reference point for understanding evolutionary phenomena in plant and animal environment adaptation.

Final comments: (enter at least one justification; no character limit)

I have no further comments other than to highlight the initiative, the constant commitment to training new scientists, and raising awareness of new scientific and technical tools to promote the conservation natural resources and sustainable fruit production.

Approval of the Annual Report
(Required Section)

Based on your knowledge and the evaluation carried out, considering all the above criteria, we kindly ask you to classify this center's annual report according to the following:

Annual Report Approved: the center is considered to have adequately achieved its goals during the evaluated year.

Annual Report Observed: improvements are considered to be implemented for the center to achieve its proposed goals during the evaluated year.

*Please justify only observed reports

Annual Report Approved	X	**Annual Report Observed**	

No further comments are needed since the decision was made after a thorough study of the report and the comments delivered on each topic.