

Another important finding from the review comes from the study by Meo et al. (2023), who applied test-type questions to ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, on basic and clinical sciences, and observed a performance of 72% correct answers. Although this percentage might seem high, the study warns that ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, has uneven performance: better in general knowledge, but with gaps in specific content and contextual interpretation. This limitation coincides with the perception of students in the present study, who were cautious regarding the real relevance of content provided by Artificial Intelligence.

Regarding the formative aspect, research by Almasre (2024), and Michel-Villarreal et al. (2023), highlight that ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, can be an excellent resource for automated feedback, especially in repetitive or structured tasks. However, they also agree that deeper pedagogical work is needed so that this technology does not substitute reasoning or personal commitment to research. In other words, artificial intelligence can be an ally, but never a replacement for critical thinking.

At the institutional level, this discussion takes on particular meaning when analyzed in light of the Institutional Educational Project (PEI) of the Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia. This project not only promotes the training of competent professionals but is also committed to social development, equity, and transformation of their contexts. In this framework, integrating artificial intelligence tools like ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, must be done intentionally, critically, and with a pedagogical approach that prioritizes meaningful learning.

The data analyzed allows affirming that the local context is not isolated from global trends. Concerns about ethical use, information quality, and development of research skills are shared by different academic communities at the international level. However, it is also true that each institution, each program, and each group of students experience this process differently, which reinforces the need for studies like this.

Finally, one of the key contributions of this initial phase is that it lays the groundwork for formulating a pedagogical proposal that articulates artificial intelligence with the development of research competencies. This proposal cannot be generic or replicate foreign models: it must be built from the concrete reality of medical students and professors, understanding their knowledge, their doubts, their expectations, and their institutional conditions.

