Research Methodology

EPV1456

Research Based Elective Placement - A First-hand Student Review

T. Porter[1] and J. Beezhold[2]*

[1]Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich and [2]Great Yarmouth Acute Services, Northgate Hospital, Great Yarmouth, United Kingdom
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2026.11694

Introduction: As per the MMBS course, we are required to partake in an external elective in the fourth year, lasting four weeks. I chose to do my elective under the guidance of a consultant psychiatrist with the goal of participating in research.
Objectives:
Primary Objectives:

1. One published article as first author
2. One published article as an additional author

Secondary Objectives
Assist the consultant in progression of his projects, aiming towards a mutually beneficial elective
1. Enhance my own skillset for my future aspirations as a researcher
Methods: The plan involved writing a poster abstract for a journal, satisfying a first author publication. The other objective would be achieved by working in tandem with the consultant on either finalising a write-up for his concluded project, or by writing up a research protocol.
In addition to this, there were opportunistic experiences during the placement, such as the ability to peer-review two studies awaiting journal publication, and critically appraising two published articles.
Results: 2 Journal reviews
2 Critical appraisals
Contributed to finalising a paper for publication
Co-wrote a research protocol
Submitted a poster abstract
Conclusions: The elective offered several experiences and opportunities for me to be involved in a variety of projects, in different aspects of the research process, from forming an idea and writing up a protocol, to reviewing finalised research projects. I believe this experience has enhanced my skillset, offered me unique insight into the world of research and provided a solid foundation to start my research career. This experience has also anecdotally shown me the importance of mentorship in supporting personal growth and development of the skills involved in research.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

EPV1457

Bringing cost-effectiveness models to life: AI Replication of a published model of venlafaxine treatment in major depressive disorder using a large language model (LLM)

N. Hawkins[1]*, R. Thompson[2], K. Subramaniam[3] and P. Purushottamahanti[4]

[1]Visible Analytics, Oxford; [2]Health Economics and Outcomes Research, Viatris, London, United Kingdom; [3]Global Medical Affairs, Viatris, Auckland, New Zealand and [4]Global Medical Affairs, Viatris, Bangalore, India
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2026.11693

Introduction: Cost-effectiveness (CE) models are an important decision-making aid when making re-imbursement decisions within resource constrained health systems. However, unlike the results of clinical trials, the findings from cost-effectiveness are highly context dependent. They may depend on choice of comparators, local cost estimates, and current estimates of effectiveness and patient utilities.
Objectives: The objective of this project was to investigate whether a fully working model adaptable to a local context could be developed using an LLM based on a published manuscript.
Methods: We attempted to develop a working version of the CE model of venlafaxine treatment described by Sobocki et al. (Sobocki et al. Int J Clin Pract, April 2008, 62, 4, 623–632) in the R statistical language using ChatGPT 5.0 based on simple prompts and a PDF copy of the manuscript.
Results: The prompt "please develop R code for the model described in this paper" produced functioning R code that did not require modification. However, the published results were not replicated. The prompt "which parameters are not explicitly stated in the paper" identified the placebo relapse rate, background mortality, and venlafaxine acquisition cost as not fully reported and identified those were most influential. In addition, ChatGPT identified the key parameters offered to 'back-fit' plausible values for these parameters. Using these estimates the model results matched published results. The model was then validated by code inspection and independent replication in R.
Conclusions: ChatGPT 5 successfully replicated the model based on simple prompts and minimal iteration. It was also able to identify inadequately specified model parameters and, significantly, able to conduct a calibration exercise to estimate these. The ability of ChatGPT 5 to replicate published cost-effectiveness models is much improved on previous versions only requiring simply prompts and, in this case, producing code that ran 'first time'. This model can be used to estimate the cost effectiveness of venlafaxine based on current costs and local contexts that may enable clinicians to make more informed clinical decisions. Will ChatGPT 5 'democratise' cost-effectiveness analysis?

Disclosure of Interest: N. Hawkins: None Declared, R. Thompson Employee of: Viatris, K. Subramaniam Employee of: Viatris, P. Purushottamahanti Employee of: Viatris

https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2026.11694 Published online by Cambridge University Press