I have looked through the submission and make the following comments:

* Scientific writing should be in third person past tense rather than first personas demonstrated by the following quotations: “ , we used a mixed approach..” and “Our results show that despite…”
* I had serious difficulty understanding some of the content of the submission, such as “Notwithstanding the countries having a regional integration system that allowed them to take into account the health crisis from a regional stance, some countries chose to gainsay agreements that sought to reduce the impact of the pandemic in the region.”
* The same applies to the following sentence which I suspect means something to the author but very little to the reader, “The execution of transitory norms for the elderly strengthened the management of the aged population in all countries, even during the health crisis, mainly through joint-negotiation channels.”
* The author(s) have used many words to say very little with very long sentences which add to the distress of the reader, as evidenced by following 2 sentences: “The beginning of the new decade marked an unprecedented epoch for humanity in terms of addressing infectious diseases of international concern. Resulting from the notification of the first case of infection by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Wuhan, China, all international, regional, and local health organizations were faced with the difficult task of managing public health systems at an accelerated pace and with a demand for care that was compromised by the already existing weaknesses of public healthcare systems [1].”
* When referencing the WHO the author(s) state, “Under no delay,” which seems inappropriate because the WHO did delay in recognising that Covid was a pandemic. Even the Prime Minister of Australia, a non-medical individual, had called out the pandemic long before the WHO condescended to do so. This same fallacy is continued with the statement, “This immediate action…” as nothing was immediate and the WHO actually dragged the chain with wide condemnation that it was pandering to Chinese influence. This is further emphasised by the citing of the date of March when there was wide acceptance of the pandemic nature of COVID, outside of the WHO by the end of January, indicating more than a month’s delay which is a significant delay when considering a virulent and markedly contagious condition, as was the case with COVID.
* Abbreviations like “i.e.,” should be avoided in scientific writing.
* Words like “however” rarely, if ever add to the meaning of material and should be avoided as per, “however, the first epidemiological readings in all countries of the world explained higher mortality…”
* ‘Furthermore’ falls into the same category as ‘however’ as shown in the following quotation, “Furthermore, concerns arose among…” and ‘thus’ as per “Thus, the COVID-19 pandemic positioned itself as a challenge …” as well as ‘therefore’, seen in “Therefore, in addition to being a structural…”
* Scientific writing should avoid emotive language, such as ‘tragic’ and colloquial terminology, such as ‘passings’ which it is presumed to mean deaths, as per “ refers to the tragic number of passings”
* At this point I will save myself further review of this paper until it has been significantly revisited, undergone a major rewrite and has been proofed by someone who has English as a more basic tool. Without this consideration the paper cannot be properly evaluated because the language is of such a quality that it distracts from any possible scientific contribution ansd that seems unfair to the authors.