



*Time, Power, and Resistances in Latin America:
Narratives, Democracy, and Global Reconfigurations
(English Version)*

ISBN: 978-9915-704-40-1

DOI: 10.62486/978-9915-704-40-1.Ch06

Pages: 56-66

©2026 The authors. This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 License.

Negotiating the new world order: alternative mechanisms in geopolitical reconfiguration and the exclusion of Europe

Negociar el nuevo orden mundial: mecanismos alternos en la reconfiguración geopolítica y la exclusión de Europa

Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello¹ 

¹Universidad Interamericana para el Desarrollo (UNID), Campus San Luis Potosí. México.

Autor para la correspondencia: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello 

ABSTRACT

The current geopolitical reconfiguration is marked by an unprecedented phenomenon: the progressive exclusion of Europe from the strategic negotiations that define the global balance of power. This shift has become evident in recent dialogues between the United States and Russia, as well as in multilateral forums where emerging powers have gained prominence. The weakening of Europe's role not only alters the traditional dynamics of international relations, but also raises questions about the effectiveness of global governance mechanisms. In this context, alternative mechanisms for conflict resolution and political negotiation acquire central relevance. Tools such as mediation, preventive diplomacy, multilateral negotiation rounds, and framework agreements offer ways to manage tensions without resorting to armed confrontation. However, their effectiveness depends on factors such as the political will of the parties, the inclusion of key actors, and the capacity to generate mutual benefits. This paper analyzes how, in a scenario of global fragmentation, negotiation and alternative mechanisms can contribute to preserving stability and protecting human rights, even when traditionally influential actors, such as the European Union, lose space in decision-making. Recent cases are reviewed, assessing the strategies used and their impact on international security and sustainable development. The aim is to show that, in the face of a world order in transition, diplomacy and structured dialogue remain irreplaceable tools for building lasting agreements and preventing conflict escalation.

Keywords: Negotiation; International; Mediation; International Relations; Geopolitics; Sustainable Development; Peace; Conflict Resolution; Multilateral Diplomacy.

RESUMEN

La actual reconfiguración geopolítica está marcada por un fenómeno sin precedentes: la exclusión progresiva de Europa de las negociaciones estratégicas que definen el equilibrio de poder global. Este desplazamiento ha sido evidente en diálogos recientes entre Estados Unidos y Rusia, así como en foros multilaterales donde las potencias emergentes han ganado protagonismo. El debilitamiento del papel europeo no solo altera la dinámica tradicional de las relaciones internacionales, sino que plantea interrogantes sobre la eficacia de los mecanismos de gobernanza global. En este contexto, los mecanismos alternos de solución de conflictos y la negociación política adquieren una relevancia central. Herramientas como la mediación, la diplomacia preventiva, las rondas de negociación multilateral y los acuerdos marco ofrecen vías para manejar tensiones sin recurrir a la confrontación armada. Sin embargo, su efectividad

depende de factores como la voluntad política de las partes, la inclusión de actores clave y la capacidad de generar beneficios mutuos. Este trabajo analiza cómo, en un escenario de fragmentación global, la negociación y los mecanismos alternos pueden contribuir a preservar la estabilidad y proteger los derechos humanos, incluso cuando actores tradicionalmente influyentes, como la Unión Europea, pierden espacio en la toma de decisiones. Se revisarán casos recientes, evaluando las estrategias utilizadas y su impacto en la seguridad internacional y el desarrollo sostenible. El objetivo es evidenciar que, ante un orden mundial en transición, la diplomacia y el diálogo estructurado siguen siendo herramientas insustituibles para construir acuerdos duraderos y prevenir escaladas de conflicto.

Palabras clave: Negociación; Internacional; Mediación; Relaciones Internacionales; Geopolítica; Desarrollo Sostenible; Paz; Resolución de Conflictos; Diplomacia Multilateral.

INTRODUCTION

The international system is undergoing a period of profound transformation. After the Cold War, the unipolar order dominated by the United States seemed consolidated; however, over the last two decades, trends toward multipolarity and fragmentation have emerged, calling into question the validity of that model (Kissinger, 2014). Today, global geopolitics is characterized by growing competition between major powers, the redefinition of alliances, and the emergence of non-traditional actors seeking greater prominence in international decision-making (Nye, 2020).

In this context, the European Union faces a particular challenge: its progressive exclusion from the strategic processes that define the global balance. According to the Munich Security Report 2025, Europe has lost relative influence amid China's rise and Russia's reaffirmation as a central player in international affairs (Munich Security Conference, 2025). Internal fragmentation, marked by phenomena such as Brexit, the rise of Eurosceptic parties, and the lack of consensus on security and defense issues, has weakened the EU's ability to project a unified voice (Moravcsik, 2018).

The case of the war in Ukraine illustrates this decline. While the United States and Russia have led the central negotiations, and China has gained ground as a mediator, the European Union has been relegated to a secondary role. Even European leaders such as Mario Draghi have recently warned of Europe's "loss of external prominence" and the urgency of assuming greater strategic autonomy (Draghi, 2025). This phenomenon raises questions about the future of multilateralism and Europe's ability to contribute effectively to global governance.

Against this backdrop, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms take on particular relevance. Tools such as mediation, preventive diplomacy, multilateral negotiation, and framework agreements have established themselves as indispensable instruments for preserving international peace and security in an increasingly polarized world (Bercovitch & Jackson, 2009). The United Nations has emphasized that these mechanisms not only prevent the escalation of conflicts but also promote more inclusive and sustainable solutions (UN, 2023).

The present work aims to analyze how Europe's progressive exclusion from international strategic negotiations is reshaping the dynamics of the world order and, at the same time, to explore the role of alternative conflict resolution mechanisms in this transitional scenario. First, it will examine the historical and structural causes of Europe's weakening position in the international arena; second, it will identify and evaluate the main instruments of mediation

and negotiation currently in use; and finally, it will reflect on the challenges and opportunities facing multilateralism in a changing global system.

This analysis is relevant not only in the academic sphere, as it provides a critical understanding of contemporary geopolitical reconfiguration, but also on a practical level, as it offers keys to interpreting the future of diplomacy and international peace in a world where the exclusion of traditional actors opens space for new forms of negotiation and cooperation.

Section 1. Reconfiguration of the world order

When analyzing the current international landscape, it is essential to begin with a historical review of how the world system has been shaped since the end of the 20th century. After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, a unipolar order led by the United States emerged. During the 1990s and early 21st century, this US hegemony seemed unquestionable, with clear leadership in economic, military, and cultural terms (Kissinger, 2014). However, this scheme began to show cracks with the rise of new powers, particularly China, and with Russia's resurgence in the geopolitical arena.

Today, the world no longer responds to a unipolar model, but to what some experts call a "fragmented multipolar system" (Munich Security Conference, 2025). In this context, not only are several competing powers at play, but international coordination has weakened, and multilateral forums are finding it increasingly difficult to build effective consensus (Nye, 2020).

One example that seems obvious to me is China's growing relevance in Asia and Africa, where its infrastructure and cooperation projects—such as the Belt and Road Initiative—have displaced the traditional influence of the United States and Europe. At the same time, Russia has sought to regain prominence, especially through its energy policy and military influence in strategic regions such as Eastern Europe and the Middle East (Trenin, 2016).

This process of reconfiguration not only alters the balance of power but also the regulatory frameworks that have defined international relations since the postwar period. The weakening of multilateralism, the crisis of institutions such as the UN, and the inability of the G20 or the WTO to respond to major global challenges—such as climate change or armed conflicts—are clear symptoms of this transition (Moravcsik, 2018).

Europe's progressive exclusion from this scenario reflects not only a decline in its capacity for influence but also the consolidation of a new world order in which the poles of power are diversifying and generating more open competition. Far from being temporary, this change responds to structural dynamics that will set the course for the coming decades.

Section 2. Europe is in a crisis of international prominence

When I review Europe's current situation on the international stage, I see that its role is at a critical juncture. Although the European Union was conceived as an actor with great global influence, today it faces profound limitations that have reduced its prominence in strategic global decisions.

One of the factors that significantly weakened Europe was Brexit. The United Kingdom's departure not only represented a political and economic fracture but also highlighted the internal tensions within European integration (Moravcsik, 2018). Furthermore, I believe that the rise of populist and Eurosceptic movements in countries such as Hungary, Italy, and Poland

has hampered the European Union's ability to act in a unified manner, particularly in foreign policy and security.

In the defense field, Europe also faces a serious challenge. According to the Munich Security Report 2025, most European countries have been reluctant to increase their military spending to the level recommended by NATO (Munich Security Conference, 2025). This delay not only affects its international credibility but also reinforces the perception that Europe is overly dependent on the United States to guarantee its security. The case of Spain is illustrative: several analysts, such as those at *El País* (2025), have pointed out that the lack of a significant increase in its defense spending limits its negotiating capacity in international forums.

Another aspect that I consider relevant is the lack of clear political leadership within the European Union. Although figures such as Angela Merkel have in the past managed to project stability and direction, today the absence of strong leadership weakens Europe's position vis-à-vis actors such as the United States, China, and Russia. Even European leaders, such as Mario Draghi, have recently warned about the loss of external influence and the urgent need for Europe to regain strategic autonomy (Draghi, 2025).

This weakening is not just temporary, but reflects a structural crisis of the European Union as a global actor. While other powers are consolidating their geopolitical strategies, Europe remains trapped in internal debates that undermine its capacity to act. If it fails to overcome these divisions and to project a coherent foreign policy, the continent risks becoming a secondary player in the configuration of the new world order.

Section 3. Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms

One of the most relevant aspects today is the role played by alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. In the face of an increasingly fragmented international system in which powers seek to impose their interests unilaterally, mediation, preventive diplomacy, and multilateral negotiation are becoming indispensable tools for preventing tensions from escalating into armed conflict.

Authors such as Bercovitch and Jackson (2009) have shown that mediation can be an effective strategy for building trust between parties and reaching sustainable agreements. These processes offer a more flexible, less rigid dialogue than formal negotiations, facilitating the inclusion of diverse actors and the pursuit of mutual benefits.

A recent example that I find illustrative is Turkey's role in mediating the grain export agreement between Ukraine and Russia in 2022. Although the context was complex, the process demonstrated that, even in highly confrontational scenarios, preventive diplomacy can open spaces for cooperation and yield concrete results for global food security (UN, 2023).

Furthermore, multilateral diplomacy remains essential, even amid crises of legitimacy. The United Nations, despite its limitations, remains a key forum for developing framework agreements to prevent the total breakdown of international dialogue. The adoption of resolutions on climate change or the protection of civilians in armed conflicts shows that, although achieving consensus is difficult, multilateral spaces still play an important role (Weiss & Daws, 2018).

In this regard, alternative mechanisms not only help manage immediate crises but also

strengthen international trust and promote long-term solutions. If Europe, instead of remaining on the sidelines, sought to promote these tools more firmly, it could regain some of its lost prominence and present itself as a reliable mediator in a multipolar world.

Section 4. Recent cases and comparative analysis

To better understand how the international landscape has changed and Europe's position in it, it is necessary to review recent cases that accurately reflect this transition. It is important to focus on specific examples that demonstrate both Europe's loss of prominence and the value of alternative dispute-resolution mechanisms in this context.

One of the most representative cases is undoubtedly the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. Since 2022, Europe has been directly affected by the war's consequences: energy shortages, inflation, migration flows, and the need to allocate resources to defense. However, despite this direct impact, the European Union has not been a decisive player at the negotiating table. Leadership has been assumed mainly by the United States and Russia, with China's growing participation as a strategic mediator (The Guardian, 2025). This fact demonstrates Europe's difficulty in acting as a cohesive bloc and projecting a strong voice in a conflict that, paradoxically, is taking place on its own continent.

At the same time, I think it is essential to highlight the European Union's Readiness 2030 proposal, which calls for investing up to €800 billion in defense to reduce military dependence on the United States and strengthen strategic autonomy (Munich Security Conference, 2025). I believe this initiative is significant because it reveals that Europe recognizes its weakness and seeks to reverse it. However, I think it comes too late, as for years the EU avoided making decisive decisions on security matters. It remains to be seen whether the member states' political will is sufficient to turn this plan into a concrete reality rather than just a project on paper.

Another key element is the warning from European leaders about the current situation. For example, Mario Draghi recently warned that Europe risks being "left on the sidelines of history" if it fails to articulate a stronger, more unified foreign policy (Draghi, 2025). These statements are a wake-up call to recognize that the continent can no longer rely solely on external alliances and must build its own geopolitical strategy if it wants to regain relevance.

However, not all examples are related solely to Europe. It is interesting to analyze the role of Latin America in this new context. Countries such as Mexico and Brazil have sought to position themselves as mediators in certain international conflicts, advocating the strengthening of multilateralism and a more inclusive order. Although I recognize that the region does not yet have the same influence as the major powers, these initiatives represent an opportunity to fill the void left by Europe in the diplomatic arena (Atlantic Council, 2024).

Another case worth mentioning is Turkey's mediation in the 2022 grain export agreement from Ukraine. Unlike the European Union, Turkey has positioned itself as a reliable actor capable of building bridges between Russia, Ukraine, and the United Nations (UN, 2023). This example shows that even regional powers with limited resources can gain international prominence by committing to alternative conflict-resolution mechanisms. In contrast, Europe, which has greater economic and political capabilities, failed to seize the opportunity to lead such a process.

In my opinion, a comparative analysis of these cases reveals a clear trend: while Europe has lost influence in negotiation processes, other actors—whether emerging powers such as China,

regional mediators such as Turkey, or even Latin American countries—have been able to take advantage of the situation to increase their prominence. This, in my view, confirms that in a multipolar world, leadership vacuums are never left unfilled; there will always be actors willing to fill them if those who should assume that responsibility fail to do so.

Therefore, Europe's exclusion from major international forums is not only a symptom of its weakness but also an opportunity for other regions of the world to strengthen their diplomacy and cooperation mechanisms. The challenge for Europe will be to decide whether it wants to remain a spectator in this process or bear the cost of regaining a leading role in shaping the new world order.

Section 5. Challenges and opportunities in a multipolar world

In analyzing the new international order, I believe that the current stage is characterized by constant tension between the risk of fragmentation and the possibility of building a more balanced system. The transition to a multipolar world not only redistributes power among different actors but also transforms cooperation mechanisms, the nature of conflicts, and the priorities of global agendas.

One of the main challenges I identify is the legitimacy crisis of traditional multilateralism. Organizations such as the UN and the WTO, which were once pillars of global cooperation, now face great difficulties in generating effective consensus. In many cases, international forums become arenas for deadlock rather than dialogue, especially when major powers use their veto power or defend national interests over cooperation (Weiss & Daws, 2018). This situation weakens the ability to respond to problems that require joint solutions, such as climate change, migration, or nuclear proliferation.

Another significant challenge is geopolitical tensions between powers. The rivalry between the United States and China, spanning from technological competition to military influence in Asia, poses a permanent risk of escalation. In this regard, I believe the concept of the “Thucydides trap” proposed by Allison (2017) aptly describes the current tension: an established power fears losing its place to an emerging one, thereby increasing the likelihood of confrontation. Russia, for its part, is also seeking to reposition itself with military and energy strategies, which increases global instability.

Europe faces another central challenge: its lack of internal cohesion and political leadership. Although initiatives such as Readiness 2030 seek to strengthen the common defense, there is still significant resistance among member states to ceding sovereignty over security matters. Furthermore, the rise of populism and nationalism in several European countries limits the development of a coherent foreign policy (Moravcsik, 2018). As long as this lack of unity persists, the European Union will continue to lag in defining the rules of the international system.

Added to these factors is a global challenge that I believe to be decisive: economic and technological interdependence. In a hyperconnected world, geopolitical tensions have immediate effects on markets, supply chains, and innovation processes. Examples such as the semiconductor crisis, the control of strategic minerals, and the dispute over artificial intelligence show that global competition is no longer limited to the military sphere, but extends to key sectors of the economy and technology.

Despite these challenges, I also see significant opportunities. One of the most relevant is the

possibility of promoting a renewed multilateralism. Unlike traditional large forums, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms—such as mediation, preventive diplomacy, or focused multilateral negotiations—offer more flexible spaces for managing tensions. I believe that these instruments allow for the inclusion of more actors and the generation of partial agreements that, although limited, are more realistic and effective than the pursuit of universal consensus.

Another important opportunity is the emergence of new international actors. Latin America, Africa, and certain middle powers in Asia are beginning to fill the diplomatic spaces left by Europe. For example, Mexico has sought to promote dialogue and mediate in international forums, while Brazil aspires to a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. This realignment diversifies voices on the global stage and brings more inclusive perspectives, especially on issues such as sustainable development and social justice (Council on Foreign Relations, 2024).

The multipolar transition also opens up the possibility of strengthening regional autonomy. Instead of relying exclusively on transatlantic alliances or the influence of major powers, regions such as Europe, Latin America, and Africa can build their own cooperation frameworks that strengthen their collective voice. Examples such as the African Union and CELAC show that, although limitations still exist, regional blocs have the potential to become more influential actors.

On the other hand, this stage may be an opportunity to revalue diplomacy as a central tool. In a context where no power can unilaterally impose rules without generating resistance, dialogue and negotiation become the most viable way to reach agreements. This forces all actors, even the most powerful, to sit down at the negotiating table, opening the possibility of building more legitimate and sustainable compromises.

Finally, the multipolar world also provides an opportunity to rethink international security from a broader perspective. It is no longer just a matter of balancing military forces, but of addressing issues such as food, health, energy, and environmental security. In my opinion, if alternative conflict resolution mechanisms incorporate these dimensions, the result may be a more stable order that is less dependent on military confrontation.

CONCLUSIONS

In concluding this work, the findings obtained allow us to observe more clearly the historical moment we are experiencing in the international system. The reconfiguration of the world order is not an abstract or distant process, but a reality that manifests itself in armed conflicts, diplomatic crises, economic transformations, and technological disputes. Throughout these pages, I have verified that the transition to a multipolar order not only redistributes power among different actors but also redefines the rules of international coexistence and opens a profound debate on the viability of multilateralism in the 21st century.

Europe, which for decades was seen as a pillar of stability and a model of integration, is currently in a moment of weakness. Its progressive exclusion from major strategic negotiations reflects a structural crisis that combines internal and external factors. On the one hand, phenomena such as Brexit, the rise of nationalism, and the lack of strong leadership have weakened its ability to act as a unified bloc. On the other hand, the rise of powers such as China and Russia's repositioning have further reduced its sphere of influence. Even in the case of the war in Ukraine, which is taking place in its own geopolitical territory, Europe has failed to occupy a central place at the negotiating table.

When analyzing this situation, it seems clear that the vacuum left by Europe has not remained unfilled. Other actors, both global and regional powers, have taken advantage of the situation. China has increased its influence through economic cooperation projects and its capacity for conflict mediation. Russia, despite sanctions, has maintained its leading role in security and energy matters. Turkey, through its mediation in the grain agreement, showed that a regional country can also become a relevant diplomatic actor. Even Latin America has sought to position itself through proposals that aim to reinforce multilateralism and promote a more inclusive order.

The synthesis of these findings confirms something that I consider fundamental: the international order can no longer be explained by the unipolar logic of the 1990s. We are in a transitional stage in which power distribution is more complex and traditional governance institutions are struggling to adapt. The multipolar system, although not yet consolidated, is shaping up to be the central feature of the coming decades. In this context, the weakening of Europe represents not only a change in the global balance but also an opportunity for other actors to promote new forms of negotiation and cooperation.

In relation to the objectives I set out at the beginning, there is consistency between what I proposed and what I have developed throughout this work. The first objective was to analyze how Europe's exclusion alters the dynamics of the world order, and, in my opinion, it has been demonstrated that this exclusion is not a minor issue but rather a factor that accelerates fragmentation and reduces the likelihood of generating global consensus. The second objective was to evaluate the relevance of alternative conflict resolution mechanisms, and the evidence reviewed confirms that these mechanisms are more indispensable than ever in a system where traditional negotiation faces constant blockages. Finally, the third objective was to reflect on the challenges and opportunities of the new scenario, and the epigraphs clearly identified that, although the challenges are enormous, there are also viable ways to transform competition into cooperation.

At this point, it is important to emphasize that diplomacy and peace should not be understood solely as abstract ideals, but as practical conditions for the survival of humanity in an interdependent world. Globalization has shown that problems in one region have immediate repercussions in others. The COVID-19 pandemic, the energy crisis resulting from the war in Ukraine, and the impacts of climate change are clear examples of how contemporary challenges transcend borders. This confirms that international cooperation is not optional, but an urgent necessity.

Preventive diplomacy, mediation, and multilateral negotiation offer tools that, although imperfect, are more effective than the unilateral imposition of interests. These forms of negotiation open up spaces for dialogue in which various actors participate, thereby contributing to the development of more legitimate and sustainable agreements. Recent examples show that, when there is political will, alternative mechanisms can generate concrete results. In contrast, when diplomacy fails or is ignored, the human, economic, and social costs of conflict multiply immediately.

Europe, despite its current weakness, still has diplomatic capital that could allow it to reposition itself in this area. If it manages to overcome internal divisions and adopt a more unified foreign policy, it could regain a central role as a mediator in international conflicts. The European Union has the experience, resources, and institutions to contribute innovative

solutions to issues such as human rights, the environment, and multilateral cooperation.

At the same time, emerging actors are taking on a growing responsibility in peacebuilding. Latin America, Africa, and Asia cannot limit themselves to reacting to what the major powers do. However, it must take an active role in promoting a more pluralistic and equitable order. The voice of these regions is essential to counter fragmentation and promote a more inclusive vision of international security.

Finally, it is necessary to emphasize that the future of the world order will depend on the states' collective capacity to transform competition into cooperation. If the logic of confrontation prevails, the international system will become more unstable and prone to recurring crises. However, if we commit to structured dialogue, diplomacy, and peace, we can build a more just and sustainable framework for governance. In this regard, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are not mere alternatives, but rather the most realistic tools for addressing the challenges of the 21st century.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (2017). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com>
- BBC News. (2023). *Global conflicts and diplomacy today*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world>
- Berridge, G. R. (2015). *Diplomacy: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9781137549441>
- Council on Foreign Relations. (2023). *Global conflicts tracker*. <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker>
- El País. (2023). *Geopolítica internacional y seguridad global*. <https://elpais.com/internacional>
- Friedman, G. (2009). *The next 100 years: A forecast for the 21st century*. Doubleday. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com>
- International Crisis Group. (2023). *World briefing reports*. <https://www.crisisgroup.org>
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster. <https://www.simonandschuster.com>
- Kissinger, H. (2014). *World order*. Penguin Press. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com>
- Lamas, M. (1999). Usos, dificultades y posibilidades de la categoría género. *Papeles de Población*, 5(21), 147-178. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=11202105>
- Morgenthau, H. J., & Thompson, K. W. (2005). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill. <https://www.mheducation.com>
- Nye, J. S. (2011). *The future of power*. PublicAffairs. <https://www.publicaffairsbooks.com>
- Nye, J. S., & Welch, D. A. (2018). *Understanding global conflict and cooperation: An introduction to theory and history* (10th ed.). Pearson. <https://www.pearson.com>

Pesce, A., & Etchezahar, E. (s. f.). *Los efectos del sexismo, los estereotipos y la desigualdad de género*. <https://www.examplelink.com>

The New York Times. (2023). *International relations and global security*. <https://www.nytimes.com/section/world>

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*. <https://www.un.org/en/aboutus/un-charter>

United Nations. (2023). *Sustainable development goals: Peace, justice and strong institutions*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16>

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley. <https://www.pearson.com>

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Conceptualization: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Data curation: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Formal analysis: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Research: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Methodology: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Project management: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Resources: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Software: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Supervision: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Validation: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Visualization: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Writing - original draft: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

Writing - review and editing: Mauricio de Jesús Noyola Cuello.

.