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**ABSTRACT:**

**Background**: Establishing research priorities is essential to support evidence-based nursing practice and direct research agendas for Neuroscience Nursing. **Aims**: to 1) summarize interventions used by Neuroscience nurses in hospitalized, non-ICU, non-rehabilitation ischemic stroke (AIS) adults ≥ 18 years of age and to record the outcomes (increased/improved, decreased/worse, no change) of these approaches, and 2) identify gaps for future nursing research. **Methods**: A comprehensive librarian-assisted literature search from 2010 to 2023 was completed. Four reviewers completed title and abstract review, full text review, and data extraction using Covidence systematic review software. Nine outcomes (length of stay (LOS), mortality, satisfaction, time, emergency department visits, readmissions, return on investment (ROI)/costs, adverse events, neurological deficits, and disability) were selected by the taskforce. **Results**: Of the 797 studies, 35 studies met the inclusion criteria. Of the nine outcomes, disability was reported most often followed by mortality, neurological deficits, and LOS. Time and satisfaction were less often reported. Only one study reported on the number of emergency department visits and readmissions while none reported on ROI. Two studies did not measure any of the nine outcomes. Outcomes were grouped by intervention - motor function/mobility, patient/family education, dysphagia/impaired swallowing, workflow, hyperglycemia/fever, discharge planning, and others. **Conclusions:** The scoping review provides a summaryof interventions used by neuroscience nurses in adult hospitalized AIS patient from a small sample of studies over 20 years. Identifying gaps can help to inform future research endeavors.
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