



**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	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/addressed outstandingly all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any weaknesses are minor.	5,0 points
Very Good	The proposal meets/addressed the aspects of the criterion very well, although some improvements are possible.	4,0 to 4,9 points
Good	The proposal meets/addressed 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/addressed aspects of the criterion, but there are significant shortcomings.	2,0 to 2,9 points
Deficient	The proposal doesn't meet/addressed aspects of the criterion or there are serious inherent deficiencies.	1,0 to 1,9 points
Doesn't qualify	The proposal doesn't meet/addressed 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 their scientific 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. Open science practises are being followed, making data accessible to the wider scientific community.

The titles of the research lines could be a bit more to the point. Similarly, it might be worth it to get the objectives a bit more focussed for future progress. Longer-term scientific projects, such as a Millennium Institute, have a tendency to get broader in their objectives the longer they run, with new activities being started without shedding older ones. The Center's management together with the principle and adjunct researchers (and possibly the young researchers, too) should discuss the future of their

activities as one Center in order to make sure that a focus is kept that leads to the overall quality in research that the Center is currently delivering.

Along similar lines, in the 2023 assessment it was suggested that the Center should aim at more coherence and a more common overall direction of the projects pursued by the groups. Funnelling the work toward a "common theme" was recommended. The Center had reacted positively to this comment. Unfortunately, however, the level of publications resulting from collaborative efforts among MI-CRG researchers reported in 2024 was not kept. It dropped from 41% to 30% (still better than the 25% in 2023). This indicates that the Center may be moving away rather than toward a more "common theme" (besides "genome").

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 decrease in collaborative publications compared to 2024. The Center should try to improve this. This does not mean that all work needs to be done collaboratively, as this would hinder scientific quality and novel developments. Still, more collaboration is needed.

The "Network Projects" initiative is an excellent idea of how to advance internal collaboration. Another example is the "1000 Genomes Chile" activity, which could form a basis of even more collaborative work within the Center, but also with scientists beyond. The Center should pursue this direction further. As a matter of fact, it may serve as a "common theme".

Students and junior scientists have been involved in the publications in 2025, including papers on which they featured as first-authors. The Center should keep up its direction in this matter.

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. This clearly indicates the high value of MI-CGR. They have published 64 research articles in peer-reviewed journals with an average impact factor of 5.64. This is a really impressive result and very good value for the money spent. While the overall number of papers was slightly smaller than 2024 (within normal fluctuation levels, however), their quality improved; this is good news. In addition, there were four book contributions. Besides a great average impact, there have been highlight publications, which are important for an activity such as MI-CGR. 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. As a matter of fact, patent applications have been filed. While patenting is not an explicit issue of the Millennium Institutes, the Center should provide value to society. Further 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 be actively pursued. There is no need that the Center itself files a patent. They may consider siding with a company, with the company doing the work and holding the patent; the Center should obtain some revenue, however, once a patent would become profitable.

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
	4.6				

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 2025, there were 128 students, of which 24 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, 25 young researchers and 22 postdoctoral scientists were involved. Particularly the increase in the number of young researchers is remarkable. Altogether, the number of students and younger scientists 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.

The students and postdocs of the Center take advantage of this wide variety of expertise of the Center's members to some extent, limited by funding available to such activities (e.g., exchanges between groups and institutions). The Center may consider processes to overcome the limitations and/or re-allocate some funding toward this end.

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 167 oral presentations and posters (substantially more than the 114 of 2024), 74% were delivered by students, postdoctoral or young researchers. This is an excellent number. The Center is clearly aiming at and active in providing education and training across its participant institutions and groups.

Students were co-authors or even first-authors on the Center's publications, which is a positive achievement. However, one would expect that the percentage of papers, on which students are co-authors, is growing beyond the 19% in 2025, which is a decrease from the 26% in 2024. As a matter of fact, an increase beyond the 26% should be achieved! Authorship documents 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 more internships – outgoing and incoming ones – than last year. As international experience and contacts will have great impact on students, the Center should try to improve on this number and is actually explicitly aiming at more of them.

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. Overall, the training aspect is covered very well indeed.

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, via 23 in 2024 to 26 in 2025. 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.

While networking is important and beneficial to science, it should not become a purpose on itself but always serve a real scientific purpose. The Center is doing very well in this respect. For all their collaborations, there seem to be very good 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)

It is difficult to judge from the outside, how easy or difficult it is to get complementary funding. From the information available to this reviewer, 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 32 (up from 21 last year) outreach activities across 5 of the country's 16 regions. Through this it engaged with more than 6,000 people, again substantially more than last year. Additionally, there were 135 appearances in the media, compared to 40 in 2025. 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 2025, the Center actively participated in establishing and strengthening connections. There were 16 activities that included meetings, conferences and panel discussions. There were 25 such activities last year. While the number is still fine, the Center should push for

interaction. It may also benefit the Center itself by providing new ideas, possibly funding and political support.

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.

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, 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 one 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 could 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 should develop further as a Center and improve beyond the already very high standard.

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



**Agencia
Nacional de
Investigación
y Desarrollo**

Ministerio de Ciencia,
Tecnología, Conocimiento
e Innovación

ANNUAL REPORT

PEER REVIEWERS' EVALUATION FORM

CENTER DIRECTOR'S LAST NAME	<i>Allende</i>
NAME OF THE INSTITUTE OR NUCLEUS	<i>Millennium Institute Center for Genome Regulation (MI-CGR)</i>
REVIEWER'S LAST NAME	
PERIOD EVALUATED	2025

- Be a friend or family member of any applicant of the project
- Have any joint publications / projects with current applicants

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/addressed outstandingly all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any weaknesses are minor.	5,0 points
Very Good	The proposal meets/addressed the aspects of the criterion very well, although some improvements are possible.	4,0 to 4,9 points
Good	The proposal meets/addressed 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/addressed aspects of the criterion, but there are significant shortcomings.	2,0 to 2,9 points
Deficient	The proposal doesn't meet/addressed aspects of the criterion or there are serious inherent deficiencies.	1,0 to 1,9 points
Doesn't qualify	The proposal doesn't meet/addressed 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 research questions and hypotheses are well-structured and scientifically relevant. Research programs are focused on genome regulation, genomics and associated interdisciplinary themes. The research questions are supported by appropriate methodologies, including genomics, computational biology and molecular approaches. The center has shown strong publication output. It maintains a good balance between basic and translational science. The data generated is deposited to public databases like NCBI. However, some projects would have benefited from clearer integration between objectives and measurable milestones.

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 institutes among the MI-CGR Center demonstrate strong collaborative interactions. The multidisciplinary composition of the teams working on different aspects of genomics, bioinformatics, molecular biology and systems biology is a major strength. International collaborations and participation in large scientific initiatives further enhance the scientific visibility of the center.

Joint publications, co-supervision of students, shared technological platforms and participation in multidisciplinary projects provide evidence for collaboration among team members. Young researchers are exposed to interdisciplinary methodologies and collaborative problem-solving approaches, which significantly strengthen their scientific training.

Interactions through seminars, workshops, collaborative meetings and international partnerships are also reported. This suggests that adequate communication among research groups is productive. The integration of computational and experimental approaches across projects is particularly noteworthy and aligns well with the Center's overall objectives in genome regulation and related areas.

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 demonstrates strong scientific productivity and a significant interdisciplinary research output. The researchers have published in reputable peer-reviewed journals, including contributions to high-impact journals in the fields of genomics, molecular biology, computational biology and related biomedical sciences. In addition to research articles, the Center has contributed through book chapters, reviews, conference proceedings and other scholarly outputs.

In addition to this, researchers have actively participated through oral and poster presentations in national and international conferences, seminars, workshops and scientific meetings. The organization of scientific events, training programs and interdisciplinary workshops further demonstrates the Center's leadership within the scientific community. The report also mentions editorial activities, advisory roles, scientific committees and collaborative networks that reflect recognition of expertise at both national and international levels. Researchers across the institutions have got distinctions such as scientific awards, honors and participation in major collaborative initiatives.

Importantly, the Center appears to also emphasize the broader societal and translational impact of its work. The knowledge generated contributes to advancing understanding in genome regulation and related biological processes. This has potential implications in sectors like healthcare, biotechnology, agriculture and public policy. Collaborative interactions with academic institutions, public organizations and industry-related sectors indicate efforts toward knowledge transfer and real-world application of research findings. Outreach and dissemination activities reported further support public engagement and scientific awareness.

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)

The Center demonstrates a strong commitment to training and human resource development. There is active involvement of undergraduate, MSc, PhD students and postdoctoral researchers in its research programs. The report reflects a healthy number of trainees distributed across multiple research groups. Students are well integrated into interdisciplinary projects involving genomics, molecular biology, computational biology and related areas. This contributes positively to the quality of their training and research exposure.

Students and postdoctoral fellows are part of scientific publications, conferences, workshops and collaborative activities. The Center also appears successful in attracting motivated young researchers. It has provided opportunities to develop technical, analytical and communication skills within an interdisciplinary framework. Such exposure is valuable for preparing students for careers in academia, industry and other scientific sectors.

The number of students graduating during the evaluation period reflects sustained training productivity. The Center contributes meaningfully to the development of qualified scientific personnel.

The report also suggests a positive representation of gender diversity among trainees and researchers. The participation of women across different academic levels, including graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, is encouraging. Continued efforts toward maintaining and strengthening gender balance would further enhance the Center's overall training ecosystem.

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)

The Center demonstrates an active and sustained commitment to the formal training of young scientists. This is being done through the participation of its researchers in undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and postdoctoral training programs. Principal investigators and senior researchers are actively involved in mentoring students, supervising theses, conducting specialized courses. Specialized workshops and seminars are also organized that contribute to scientific capacity building.

The report indicates that students and early-career researchers are integrated into interdisciplinary research projects. This provides them opportunities to gain exposure to advanced experimental, computational and analytical methodologies. Such experiences are valuable in developing technical expertise, critical thinking, scientific communication and collaborative skills among young researchers.

The Center also appears to foster an environment that encourages interaction between trainees and researchers from diverse scientific backgrounds. The involvement of researchers in specialized academic programs, mentoring activities and outreach initiatives reflects a strong institutional commitment to nurturing the next generation of scientists.

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)

The Center's students appear to be actively engaged in a variety of academically relevant activities. According to the report, students have participated in national and international congresses, scientific forums, workshops, seminars and specialized training activities. They presented research findings through oral and poster presentations. Such participation demonstrates the Center's commitment to integrating students into the broader scientific community. This also provides them with opportunities to develop communication, networking and critical-thinking skills.

The academic relevance of these activities is significant. The students are exposed to current advances in genomics, molecular biology, computational biology and related interdisciplinary areas.

The students are also reported to have benefited from both internal and external internship opportunities. These internships appear diverse in scope, involving collaborations with national and international laboratories, research institutes and interdisciplinary projects. External internships and research exchanges, which contribute to strengthening the students' academic maturity and collaborative abilities, are also taken.

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 a highly interdisciplinary and collaborative research environment. There is active integration of undergraduate, MSc, PhD students and postdoctoral researchers into ongoing scientific projects. The Center also appears successful in promoting student participation in scientific publications, conferences, workshops, seminars and collaborative initiatives.

Another important achievement is the strong mentorship provided by principal investigators and senior researchers. Students are exposed to multidisciplinary problem-solving approaches and international collaborations, which help them develop technical competence, scientific communication skills and research independence. The Center continues to grow, maintaining balanced mentorship and ensuring equitable access to opportunities across all research groups, which may require continued attention. Additionally, clearer long-term tracking of trainee outcomes, including career progression, academic placements and contributions to industry or public sectors, would provide a stronger assessment. Expanding structured professional development activities focused on entrepreneurship, translational research and leadership skills could also further enhance trainee preparedness.

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 Center has demonstrated substantial progress in establishing and strengthening collaborative research networks at both national and international levels. The report reflects a well-developed collaborative strategy involving partnerships with universities, research institutes, scientific consortia and interdisciplinary research groups. These collaborations appear closely aligned with the Center's objectives and they contribute positively to the scientific quality and visibility.

A notable strength of the collaborative network plan is the integration of researchers from diverse scientific disciplines. The Center has also maintained active participation in international scientific initiatives, collaborative publications, workshops, exchange programs and joint research activities. These interactions have strengthened scientific capacity, facilitated knowledge exchange and expanded opportunities for students and early-career researchers.

The Center has reported adapting and refining aspects of its collaborative strategy over time in response to evolving scientific priorities and emerging opportunities. Adjustments to the original objectives appear to have been implemented in a constructive manner. There is incorporation of new interdisciplinary approaches, technological platforms and expanded international interactions. However, there are few challenges such as coordination across institutions, integration of diverse research activities and long-term sustainability of partnerships. The team has managed these effectively while maintaining research productivity and collaborative engagement.

As already discussed, the collaborative networks have resulted in several important achievements and measurable outcomes. These include joint scientific publications in reputable journals, participation in international conferences and scientific forums, collaborative grant activities. There are training opportunities for students and postdoctoral researchers and the development of shared research resources and expertise.

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)

External funding opportunities through national and international research grants, collaborative projects and partnerships with academic and scientific organizations have also been mentioned. These efforts demonstrate proactive resource management and contribute positively to the expansion of the Center's scientific capabilities.

The collaborative nature of the research programs has likely facilitated access to additional funding sources by enabling participation in multidisciplinary and multi-institutional initiatives. International collaborations, shared infrastructure and joint scientific projects further enhance the Center's ability to leverage resources and attract competitive funding. The report also indicates engagement in activities that may support long-term sustainability.

While the report primarily emphasises academic and scientific collaborations, there are also indications of efforts to establish connections with applied and translational sectors. The Director may try for more future public or private partnerships. Continued development of industry-linked collaborations, technology transfer initiatives and translational research programs could further strengthen and diversify funding sources.

COMPONENT 3: NETWORKING

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

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn't qualify
	4.9				

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 has developed a relevant and well-structured outreach and dissemination strategy. Their strategy aligns effectively with scientific objectives and broader societal responsibilities as mentioned in the proposal. The dissemination activities described in the report demonstrate a clear effort to communicate scientific knowledge. They have targeted diverse audiences, including students, educators, researchers, policymakers and the general public. The integration of outreach within the Center's overall mission is a notable strength. This reflects an awareness of the societal importance of scientific communication and public engagement.

The outreach plan incorporates a variety of dissemination formats including workshops, seminars, public lectures, educational activities, scientific forums, digital communication platforms and participation in outreach events. These activities appear innovative in their interdisciplinary approach and are important to translate complex scientific concepts into accessible formats for non-specialized audiences. The inclusion of training-oriented activities like interactions with schools, universities and broader community groups further enhances the educational value and their outreach efforts.

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 meaningful engagement with multiple external sectors, including academic institutions, public organizations, educational initiatives and broader societal stakeholders. These interactions contribute positively to the visibility, applicability and broader relevance of the Center's work.

In the educational sphere, the Center has established strong connections through training programs, workshops, seminars, outreach activities and collaborations with universities and research institutions. These initiatives support the development of scientific capacity. They also provide opportunities for students, teachers and early-career researchers to engage with advanced scientific concepts and methodologies.

The Center also appears to maintain constructive interactions with public and scientific sectors through outreach activities. Outreach programs and dissemination initiatives aimed at increasing scientific awareness demonstrate commitment to social responsibility. Such activities contribute qualitatively to improving public understanding of genomics and related scientific fields.

Although the report primarily emphasizes academic and scientific collaborations, there are indications of efforts toward translational and applied research with potential relevance to productive and technological sectors. The interdisciplinary expertise and collaborative framework of the Center create favorable conditions for future partnerships with industry and innovation-oriented sectors. However, more detailed quantitative information regarding industry-linked projects, technology transfer outcomes, patents, or partnerships with NGOs and productive sectors would strengthen the outcome.

COMPONENT 4: OUTREACH

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

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Regular	Deficient	Doesn't qualify
	4.9				

General Comments

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

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

1. Some sections lack clear quantitative indicators of impact and outcome assessment.
2. There is limited discussion on long-term translational outcomes and technology transfer.
3. Sustainability strategies for collaborative networks could be described in greater detail.
4. More explicit tracking of trainee career progression and placement outcomes would strengthen the report.
5. Outreach activities are extensive, but measurable indicators of public engagement impact are limited.

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

1. Strong interdisciplinary integration across genomics, molecular biology, computational biology and translational sciences.
2. High scientific productivity with publications, conferences, workshops and collaborative outputs.
3. Excellent collaborative environment involving principal investigators, students, postdoctoral fellows and international partners.
4. Active training and mentorship of undergraduate, MSc, PhD students and postdoctoral researchers.
5. Strong participation in national and international scientific networks and collaborations.
6. Effective integration of computational and experimental approaches across projects.
7. Diverse and socially relevant outreach and dissemination activities.
8. Good scientific visibility and contribution to capacity building in genome regulation research.

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

1. The Center demonstrates substantial scientific progress and maintains a productive interdisciplinary research environment.
2. Research activities are well aligned with the Center's objectives and show strong collaborative integration.
3. The Center has made meaningful contributions in research, training, outreach and scientific networking.
4. Student and early-career researcher involvement in scientific activities is particularly commendable.
5. Collaborative networks and dissemination strategies significantly enhance the Center's visibility and societal relevance.
6. Continued emphasis on measurable impact indicators, translational outcomes and long-term sustainability planning would further strengthen future development.
7. Overall, the Center represents a strong and well-organized research initiative with significant academic and societal value.

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

☒

Annual Report Observed

☐

The Center is considered to have adequately achieved its objectives during the evaluated period. The overall quality of research outputs, collaborative initiatives, and student involvement reflects a well-organized and productive research environment aligned with the Center's stated goals.