STM JOURNALS

International Journal of
Virus Studies

ISSN:3049-1924
Volume 2, Issue 2, 2025
July–December
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/IJVS

https://journals.stmjournals.com/ijvs/

Review IJVS

Advancing Gene Therapy: Next-Generation Viral Vector Engineering for Precision, Safety, and Scalability

Mehak Khanum[1,*], Jennifer S.[1], Zaid Khan[2], Ehsan Mohebi[2]

Abstract

Gene therapy has emerged as a paradigm-shifting modality for the treatment of genetic disorders, malignancies, and rare diseases through the delivery of therapeutic nucleic acids aimed at correcting or modulating dysfunctional gene expression. Among the various delivery systems, viral vectors including adeno-associated viruses (AAVs), lentiviruses, adenoviruses, retroviruses, and herpes simplex viruses have proven indispensable owing to their high transduction efficiencies and adaptability. This review offers a comprehensive assessment of viral vector optimization, tracing their historical development, identifying prevailing limitations, and highlighting recent advances in vector engineering. Critical barriers, such as limited tissue specificity, immunogenic responses, cargo size restrictions, and challenges in large-scale production, are systematically analyzed. Innovations in capsid engineering, the use of synthetic regulatory elements, and artificial intelligence (AI)-driven vector design are progressively mitigating these limitations, thereby enhancing vector safety, specificity, and therapeutic efficacy. Notable clinical successes, including Zolgensma for spinal muscular atrophy and Luxturna for inherited retinal dystrophies, underscore the clinical relevance of optimized vectors. The review also delineates a translational roadmap emphasizing the need for interdisciplinary collaboration, advanced biomanufacturing capabilities, and regulatory alignment to facilitate global accessibility and long-term clinical safety. Future perspectives include the integration of AI-assisted capsid design, CRISPR-based site-specific genome editing, and modular vector platforms to expedite the advancement of next-generation gene therapies.

Keywords: Gene therapy, viral vectors, vector engineering, capsid modification, CRISPR integration, immunogenicity, biomanufacturing, AI in gene delivery

INTRODUCTION

Gene Therapy: Advancements in Viral Vectors and Roadmap for Clinical Translation

Gene therapy represents a transformative modality for the treatment of genetic disorders, malignancies, and rare diseases by enabling the targeted delivery of therapeutic nucleic acids aimed at correcting or modulating aberrant genes. Unlike conventional pharmacological approaches, which often provide only symptomatic relief, gene therapy targets the underlying genetic etiology of diseases, offering the potential for curative interventions. Viral vectors including adeno-associated viruses (AAVs), lentiviruses, and others are fundamental to the success of gene delivery owing to their intrinsic ability to transduce host cells with high efficiency. This review critically examines the evolving role of viral vectors in gene therapy, delineates their historical development, identifies persisting translational challenges, and proposes innovative strategies to advance the clinical applicability of next-generation vectors. A schematic model illustrating the gene delivery process via viral vectors is also discussed.

***Author for Correspondence**
Mehak Khanum
E-mail: khanummehak12@gmail.com

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Pharmaceutics, Faculty of Pharmacy, St. Jhon's Pharmacy College, Bangalore, Karnataka, India
[2]Intern, Pharm D, Research Scholar, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Faculty of Pharmacy, Aditya Bangalore Institute of Pharmacy Education and Research, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Received Date: July 07, 2025
Accepted Date: July 29, 2025
Published Date: August 02, 2025

Citation: Mehak Khanum, Jennifer S., Zaid Khan, Ehsan Mohebi. Advancing Gene Therapy: Next-Generation Viral Vector Engineering for Precision, Safety, and Scalability. International Journal of Virus Studies. 2025; 2(2): 37–55p.

The Clinical and Therapeutic Significance of Gene Therapy

Gene therapy holds promise in addressing a spectrum of pathologies that were previously considered untreatable. For monogenic disorders, such as cystic fibrosis and Duchenne muscular dystrophy, gene replacement or editing techniques, aim to restore normal gene function. In the oncological context, gene therapy can be employed to enhance immune surveillance through modalities like chimeric antigen receptor (CAR)-T cell therapy or the introduction of tumor-suppressing transgenes. For rare genetic diseases, such as spinal muscular atrophy (SMA), AAV-mediated gene therapies (e.g., Zolgensma), have demonstrated substantial clinical efficacy, underscoring the paradigm-shifting potential of this therapeutic approach. The breadth of gene therapy applications extends from monogenic to multifactorial conditions, thereby offering the possibility of disease modification or even cure [1].

Viral Vectors: Cornerstones of Gene Delivery

Viral vectors are genetically modified viruses engineered to deliver therapeutic DNA or RNA into host cells. Their natural tropism for cellular entry and genomic integration renders them ideal candidates for efficient gene transfer. Common viral vectors include:

- *Adeno-Associated Viruses (AAVs):* Non-pathogenic vectors with low immunogenicity and long-term episomal persistence. AAVs have gained prominence in clinical settings due to their safety profile, exemplified by FDA-approved products like *Luxturna* for inherited retinal dystrophies. However, their limited packaging capacity (~4.7 kb) constrains the delivery of larger genes.
- *Lentiviruses:* These vectors, derived from human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), can integrate transgenes into the host genome, facilitating long-term expression in dividing cells. They are widely used in hematopoietic stem cell modification, notably in CAR-T cell therapies. Nonetheless, integration carries the risk of insertional mutagenesis.
- *Other Vectors:* Adenoviruses, retroviruses, and herpes simplex viruses (HSV) offer varying advantages. Adenoviruses provide high transduction efficiency but can elicit robust immune responses, thus limiting their application. Retroviruses and HSVs present challenges related to genomic stability and specificity.

Vector selection is guided by the disease context, targeted tissue type, duration of gene expression, and safety considerations [2].

Historical Evolution of Viral Vectors

The development of viral vectors has undergone significant refinement over the past three decades. Initial clinical trials in the 1990s utilizing retroviral vectors were marred by adverse outcomes, such as leukemogenesis in patients with severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID-X1) due to insertional mutagenesis. These setbacks catalyzed the shift toward AAVs, which demonstrated improved safety profiles and clinical viability, culminating in the approval of *Glybera* (2012) and *Luxturna* (2017). Subsequent advancements in vector engineering, such as pseudo typing, synthetic promoter integration, and capsid modification, have enhanced tissue specificity, minimized immunogenicity, and improved therapeutic index. These innovations have transformed viral vectors from rudimentary gene carriers into sophisticated platforms for precision medicine.

Current Gaps and Limitations in the Field

Despite significant strides, several critical gaps persist in the gene therapy landscape

- *Tissue-Specific Targeting:* Many current vectors lack the capacity for precise tissue tropism, leading to unintended transduction and diminished therapeutic efficacy. Targeted capsid engineering and ligand-conjugated delivery remain areas requiring further development.
- *Scalable Manufacturing:* Clinical-grade vector production remains costly and labor-intensive. Efficient, reproducible, and scalable bioprocesses are essential to meet growing clinical demands.
- *Immunogenicity:* Pre-existing antibodies against AAVs and immune responses to other vectors, such as adenoviruses, hinder therapeutic success. Novel strategies for immune evasion or immunosuppression are inadequately explored.

- *Cargo Size Constraints:* The limited transgene capacity of AAV vectors restricts their applicability to larger or more complex genetic payloads. Dual-vector systems or non-viral carriers represent potential alternatives [3].

Advancements in Vector Engineering

Contemporary vector engineering strategies aim to optimize transduction efficiency, tissue targeting, and safety.

- *Capsid Engineering:* Techniques, such as directed evolution and machine learning, have enabled the generation of capsid variants with enhanced tropism for example, AAV9 for central nervous system delivery.
- *Promoter Optimization:* The use of cell-type-specific and inducible promoters reduces off-target expression and enhances therapeutic precision.
- *Self-Inactivating Lentiviral Vectors:* Integration of self-inactivating (SIN) long terminal repeats mitigates the risk of insertional mutagenesis.
- *Immune Evasion Mechanisms:* Engineered capsids and transient immunosuppressive regimens prolong vector persistence and enhance therapeutic outcomes.

Such innovations have led to the development of highly effective therapeutics, such as *Zolgensma*, which utilizes AAV9 to deliver the survival motor neuron 1 (SMN1) gene in patients with SMA.

Challenges in Pharmaceutical Translation

The successful translation of gene therapy from laboratory to clinic faces substantial challenges:

- *Manufacturing Complexities:* Current vector production systems are expensive, and batch-to-batch variability hampers consistency. Innovations in bioreactor systems and downstream purification are urgently needed.
- *Regulatory Oversight:* Regulatory agencies impose rigorous standards for safety, efficacy, and manufacturing consistency. This necessitates comprehensive preclinical and clinical validation frameworks.
- *Targeted Delivery Barriers:* Efficient delivery to difficult-to-access tissues, such as the brain, poses significant challenges due to biological barriers like the blood-brain barrier (BBB).
- *Economic Barriers:* The high cost of gene therapies (e.g., over $2 million per dose for *Zolgensma*) raises concerns about accessibility and healthcare equity [4].

Innovative Strategies for Next-Generation Vector Platforms

To address existing limitations, the following innovative approaches are proposed:

- *Synthetic Hybrid Vectors:* Combining viral and non-viral components may optimize delivery efficiency and scalability.
- *AI-Guided Vector Design:* Machine learning algorithms can predict optimal capsid sequences for enhanced tissue-specific transduction and immune evasion.
- *Modular Vector Architectures:* Development of customizable platforms allows rapid adaptation for diverse therapeutic applications, reducing development timelines.
- *Advanced Biomanufacturing:* Integration of cell-free systems and automated bioreactors can reduce costs and improve reproducibility.
- *Immune Modulation Strategies:* Engineering vectors to evade immune detection or using novel immunosuppressive regimens may enhance patient response and expand eligibility.

A Roadmap Towards Clinical Translation

Bridging the gap between preclinical research and clinical implementation requires a coordinated, multidisciplinary framework.

- *Fundamental Research:* Advance understanding of vector biology and host interactions to guide rational design of next-generation delivery systems.

- *Preclinical Testing:* Employ physiologically relevant models (e.g., human organoids, transgenic animals) to assess biodistribution, safety, and efficacy.
- *Scalable Manufacturing:* Foster industry-academic partnerships to streamline vector production under Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP).
- *Clinical Trial Design:* Implement adaptive and phase-accelerated trial designs to expedite regulatory approval while ensuring safety.
- *Policy Development:* Advocate for regulatory and reimbursement reforms to improve patient access and long-term sustainability of gene therapy programs.

This roadmap highlights a translational strategy encompassing discovery, development, and delivery to realize the full potential of gene therapy in clinical medicine [5].

Fundamentals of Viral Vectors in Gene Therapy

Viral vectors represent a cornerstone of gene therapy, functioning as delivery systems to introduce therapeutic genetic material into target cells for the treatment of genetic disorders, malignancies, and rare diseases. By capitalizing on the natural mechanisms of viral infection, these vectors enable efficient and targeted gene transfer. This review provides a comprehensive overview of the principal types of viral vectors, their mechanisms of action, physicochemical and biological properties, historical development, and therapeutic applications. Emphasis is placed on adeno-associated viruses (AAV), lentiviruses, and other clinically relevant vectors, with a critical analysis of their advantages, limitations, and recent technological advancements.

TYPES OF VIRAL VECTORS

Adeno-Associated Viruses (AAV)

AAVs are small, non-pathogenic parvoviruses characterized by a single-stranded DNA genome of approximately 4.7 kilobases. They exhibit minimal immunogenicity and facilitate long-term gene expression, particularly in non-dividing cells. The diversity of AAV serotypes (e.g., AAV2, AAV9) enables tissue-specific targeting. For example, AAV9 has demonstrated efficacy in delivering genes to the central nervous system (CNS). Nevertheless, the limited cargo capacity restricts their use for larger genetic constructs, prompting the development of dual-vector strategies in certain applications [6].

Lentiviruses

Lentiviruses, derived from the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), are enveloped retroviruses capable of accommodating larger genetic payloads (approximately 8–10 kb). Their capacity for stable genomic integration allows for long-term transgene expression in both dividing and non-dividing cells. Lentiviral vectors are extensively employed in ex vivo gene therapies, such as chimeric antigen receptor T-cell (CAR-T) therapies targeting hematologic malignancies. However, the risk of insertional mutagenesis remains a safety concern, although this has been substantially mitigated by self-inactivating (SIN) vector designs [7].

Other Viral Vectors

- *Adenoviruses:* These double-stranded DNA viruses offer high transduction efficiency and a comparatively large transgene capacity (~7–36 kb). They are frequently utilized in oncolytic virotherapy and vaccine platforms. However, their strong immunogenic profile limits their suitability for sustained gene expression.
- *Retroviruses:* Simple retroviruses, such as murine leukemia virus, integrate exclusively into dividing cells, making them appropriate for ex vivo applications. Nonetheless, early clinical studies, including those involving severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID-X1), revealed a heightened risk of insertional mutagenesis, which has constrained their broader application.
- *Herpes Simplex Viruses (HSV):* HSV vectors exhibit an exceptionally large cargo capacity (~150 kb), rendering them suitable for delivering complex or multiple genes, particularly within neuronal tissues. Despite their utility, challenges, such as cytotoxicity and pronounced immune activation, remain to be addressed [8].

MECHANISMS OF ACTION

Gene Delivery, Expression, and Regulation

Viral vectors mediate the delivery of therapeutic DNA or RNA to target cells, wherein the genetic payload is transcribed and translated to elicit a therapeutic effect. The mechanism encompasses several key stages.

- *Cellular Binding and Entry:* Viral particles engage with specific cellular receptors via their capsid or envelope proteins and are internalized through endocytosis or membrane fusion.
- *Nuclear Translocation:* Upon entry, the viral genome is released into the cytoplasm and subsequently transported to the nucleus. While AAV vectors remain predominantly episomal, lentiviral vectors integrate into the host genome, enabling persistent gene expression.
- *Gene Expression:* Transgene expression is driven by promoter elements embedded within the vector, resulting in mRNA synthesis and subsequent protein translation. Tissue-specific or inducible promoters may be employed to enhance target specificity and reduce off-target effects.
- *Regulatory Control:* The incorporation of regulatory sequences, such as enhancers, silencers, and inducible promoters, enables the modulation of expression levels, enhancing therapeutic efficacy while minimizing adverse effects [9].

Tropism and Cellular Entry Mechanisms

Tropism denotes the preferential targeting of specific cell types by a viral vector, largely governed by interactions between viral surface proteins and host cell receptors:

- *AAV:* Serotype-dependent receptor recognition facilitates tissue-specific delivery (e.g., AAV2 binds heparan sulfate proteoglycans; AAV9 crosses the blood-brain barrier). Rational capsid engineering further enhances tissue tropism and transduction efficiency.
- *Lentiviruses:* Pseudo typing with vesicular stomatitis virus glycoprotein (VSV-G) expands the range of susceptible cell types by promoting entry via low-density lipoprotein receptors.
- *Adenoviruses:* These vectors typically utilize coxsackievirus and adenovirus receptors (CAR) for cellular entry. Modifications to fiber knob domains can alter receptor binding and redirect tropism, thereby influencing therapeutic outcomes and safety profiles [10].

KEY VECTOR PROPERTIES

Payload Capacity

- *AAV:* Approximately 4.7 kb, suitable for small therapeutic genes (e.g., SMN1 in spinal muscular atrophy).
- *Lentiviruses:* 8–10 kb, accommodating more complex or polycistronic transgenes (e.g., CAR constructs).
- *Adenoviruses:* 7–36 kb, supporting delivery of multiple genes or large genetic elements.
- *Retroviruses:* ~8 kb, comparable to lentiviruses but limited to dividing cells.
- *HSV:* Up to 150 kb, enabling delivery of entire genomic loci or multiple genes.

Transduction Efficiency

- *AAV:* High efficiency in non-dividing cells, such as neurons and hepatocytes.
- *Lentiviruses:* Efficient in both dividing and non-dividing cells, particularly hematopoietic and stem cells.
- *Adenoviruses:* High initial efficiency, but gene expression is typically transient due to immune-mediated clearance.
- *Retroviruses:* Limited to dividing cells, reducing efficacy in quiescent tissues.
- *HSV:* High transduction rates in neurons, less efficient in other cell types [11].

Host Immune Response

- *AAV:* Elicits minimal immune activation, however, pre-existing neutralizing antibodies may compromise vector efficacy.

- *Lentiviruses:* Moderate immunogenicity; VSV-G pseudo typing may trigger pro-inflammatory responses.
- *Adenoviruses:* Induce robust innate and adaptive immune responses, limiting clinical utility for repeated dosing.
- *Retroviruses:* Moderate immunogenicity; integration-associated risks persist.
- *HSV:* Highly immunogenic and potentially cytotoxic, restricting therapeutic use without immunosuppression [12].

Safety Considerations

- *Insertional Mutagenesis:* Integration into the host genome, particularly by lentiviruses and retroviruses may activate oncogenes, posing a risk of malignant transformation. The adoption of SIN designs has significantly mitigated this hazard.
- *Off-Target Effects:* Non-specific transduction may result in ectopic expression. This is addressed using tissue-specific or inducible promoter systems.
- *Immune Activation:* Vectors, such as adenoviruses and HSV, can provoke pronounced immune responses, occasionally necessitating the use of immunosuppressive agents during therapy.
- *Vector Stability:* AAVs exhibit high stability and remain episomal, reducing genotoxic potential compared to integrating vectors [13].

Historical Milestones in Viral Vector Development

- *1990s:* Initial clinical successes using retroviral vectors in SCID-ADA trials demonstrated the feasibility of gene therapy but also revealed risks related to insertional mutagenesis.
- *1999:* The death of Jesse Gelsinger during an adenoviral gene therapy trial underscored the critical need for rigorous safety protocols and halted momentum in the field.
- *2000s:* AAV vectors gained prominence, particularly following successful trials for Leber's congenital amaurosis, which ultimately led to the approval of Luxturna in 2017.
- *2012:* Glybera, an AAV-based treatment for lipoprotein lipase deficiency, became the first gene therapy approved in Europe [14].
- *2019:* The FDA approval of Zolgensma, an AAV9-based therapy for spinal muscular atrophy, represented a significant advance in pediatric gene therapy.
- *2020s:* Rapid innovations in capsid engineering, scalable manufacturing, and clinical validation have led to the widespread adoption of viral vectors in personalized therapies, including lentiviral CAR-T cell products, such as Kymriah, revolutionizing cancer treatment paradigms (Table 1) [15].

Table 1. Comparative table of viral vector types.

Vector Type	Payload Capacity	Tropism	Transduction Efficiency	Safety Profile	Applications
AAV	~4.7 kb	Tissue-specific (serotype-dependent, e.g., AAV9 for CNS)	High in non-dividing cells	Low immunogenicity, episomal, minimal genotoxicity	Luxturna, Zolgensma, retinal/CNS disorders
Lentivirus	~8–10 kb	Broad (VSV-G pseudotyping)	High in dividing/non-dividing cells	Risk of insertional mutagenesis, moderate immunogenicity	CAR-T therapies, hematopoietic disorders
Adenovirus	~7–36 kb	Broad (CAR-dependent)	High but transient	Strong immune response, cytotoxic	Oncolytic therapies, vaccines
Retrovirus	~8 kb	Dividing cells only	Moderate	Insertional mutagenesis risk	Ex vivo therapies (e.g., SCID)
HSV	~150 kb	Neurons primarily	High in neurons	High immunogenicity, cytotoxic	Neurological disorders

ADVANCE IN AAV VECTOR ENGINEERING FOR GENE THERAPY

Capsid Engineering and Directed Evolution for Enhanced Tissue Tropism

Directed evolution is a powerful strategy that entails generating diverse libraries of AAV capsid variants through methods, such as random peptide insertion, capsid shuffling, or error-prone PCR.

These libraries are subsequently subjected to selective pressures to identify capsids with desirable traits, notably enhanced tissue specificity. This technique has led to the development of novel AAV variants capable of targeting specific tissues, such as the central nervous system (CNS) or skeletal muscle. For instance, Tabebordbar et al. identified MyoAAV 1A, a capsid variant exhibiting a 10–29-fold increase in muscle transduction efficiency compared to AAV9 in murine models. This was achieved by inserting randomized 7-mer peptides into the hypervariable region VIII of the AAV9 capsid [16]. Similarly, the BRAVE (Barcoded Rational AAV Vector Evolution) approach yielded capsids, such as MNM031 and MNM034, which demonstrated superior transduction of glial cells in human CNS organoid models [17].

Rational Capsid Design for Immune Evasion

Rational capsid engineering employs structural and computational insights to modify specific amino acid residues on the viral capsid, thereby enhancing vector properties, such as immune evasion and tissue specificity. For example, AAV9.HR engineered from a chimpanzee-derived capsid (CLv-D8) incorporated mutations at the 3-fold protrusions of the capsid, significantly reducing hepatic tropism to 0.5% of that seen with AAV9, while preserving CNS targeting in a murine model of Canavan disease [18]. Another variant, AAV-LP2-10, created through the recombination of capsid elements from AAV2, AAV6, AAV8, and AAV9, successfully evaded pre-existing neutralizing antibodies in humanized mice, maintaining immunogenicity levels comparable to native AAV9 [19].

Specialized Capsids for CNS and Liver Targeting

AAV9 has been extensively utilized due to its inherent ability to traverse the blood-brain barrier (BBB), making it an effective vehicle for CNS gene delivery. Engineered derivatives, such as AAV.cc47 developed via multi-species directed evolution, have demonstrated superior transduction efficacy in CNS, cardiac, and skeletal muscle tissues across multiple species, including mice, pigs, and macaques [20]. For hepatic targeting, machine learning-guided approaches, such as Fit4Function, have enabled the identification of capsids with enhanced liver specificity and minimal off-target activity. Validation in cynomolgus macaques revealed up to a 100-fold enrichment of vector DNA in hepatic tissue compared to AAV9 [21].

Genome Optimization

Self-Complementary AAVs for Accelerated Transgene Expression Self-complementary AAVs (scAAVs) are designed to carry a double-stranded DNA genome, obviating the requirement for second-strand synthesis by host polymerases. This results in accelerated and enhanced transgene expression relative to single-stranded AAVs (ssAAVs). Preclinical studies, such as those conducted by Gray et al., have demonstrated the superior efficacy of scAAVs in CNS applications, particularly in conditions requiring rapid onset of gene expression, such as spinal muscular atrophy (SMA) [22].

Vector Genome Minimization to Reduce Off-Target Effects

Minimizing the AAV vector genome by eliminating non-essential viral sequences and optimizing the transgene cassette reduces the likelihood of off-target expression and innate immune activation. Specific modifications, such as the reduction of CpG motifs, have been shown to diminish toll-like receptor 9-mediated inflammation, thus enhancing vector safety [23].

Synthetic Promoters for Tissue-Specific or Inducible Expression

Synthetic promoters have been engineered to improve tissue specificity and inducible control of gene expression. For instance, synthetic promoters tailored for muscle tissue have demonstrated greater activity than their endogenous counterparts, increasing precision in muscle-directed gene therapies [24]. Likewise, glial fibrillary acidic protein (GFAP)-derived promoters have been utilized to restrict expression to astrocytes in CNS applications, thereby reducing off-target transduction [25].

Payload Enhancements

Codon Optimization for Enhanced Transgene Expression Codon optimization involves the redesign of transgene sequences to reflect the host's codon usage bias, thereby improving translational efficiency

and protein yield. In clinical trials for hemophilia B, codon-optimized factor IX (FIX) transgenes significantly enhanced therapeutic expression levels, contributing to clinical efficacy despite challenges posed by host immune responses [26].

Incorporation of Regulatory Elements (e.g., miRNA Binding Sites)

The addition of microRNA (miRNA) binding sites to the 3' untranslated region of the transgene permits post-transcriptional regulation, effectively suppressing off-target expression in non-desired tissues. This approach has been particularly beneficial in CNS applications, enhancing specificity and mitigating adverse effects by leveraging endogenous miRNA profiles [27].

Safety Improvements

Non-integrating vectors to minimize genotoxic risk is one of the intrinsic safety advantages of AAV vectors is their predominantly episomal persistence within host cells, which minimizes the risk of insertional mutagenesis compared to integrating vectors. Long-term follow-up data from clinical trials in hemophilia and SMA have demonstrated durable gene expression with negligible evidence of genomic integration or oncogenic transformation [28].

Immune Evasion Strategies (e.g., Capsid Decoys, PEGylation)

Several immune-evasion strategies have been developed to enhance the systemic stability of AAV vectors and prevent neutralization by pre-existing antibodies. These include the use of capsid decoys non-functional empty capsids that compete with the therapeutic vector for antibody binding and PEGylation, which involves the covalent attachment of polyethylene glycol to the capsid surface. PEGylation has been shown to increase serum stability and reduce immunogenicity, particularly in pulmonary gene delivery models [29, 30].

Clinical Evidence

Recent clinical trials underscore the translational success of engineered AAV vectors:

- *Zolgensma (AAV9, SMA):* Although approved in 2019, post-marketing surveillance and longitudinal studies published after 2020 affirm sustained motor function improvement with minimal adverse events in pediatric SMA patients [31].
- *Hemgenix (AAV5, Hemophilia B, 2022):* This gene therapy utilizes a codon-optimized FIX transgene and has demonstrated durable FIX expression with a substantial reduction in bleeding episodes. Mild transient hepatotoxicity was the most frequently observed adverse event [32].
- *Elevidys (AAVrh74, Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy, 2023):* Employing a muscle-tropic capsid, Elevidys showed significant functional gains in early-phase trials, although immune-related adverse events, such as fever and liver enzyme elevation, were reported [33].

Therapeutic Outcomes: Enhanced Efficacy and Reduced Adverse Events

Engineered AAV capsids have demonstrated marked improvements in therapeutic efficacy by increasing transduction efficiency and tissue specificity. For instance, the cross-species applicability of AAV.cc47 has enabled dose reduction, thereby minimizing hepatotoxicity and other vector-associated toxicities. Nonetheless, challenges, such as immune-mediated transgene loss, as observed in early AAV2.hFIX trials, continue to warrant attention.

Meta-Analysis of Engineered AAV Vector Performance

A meta-analysis of studies published post-2020 compared transduction efficiencies of engineered AAV variants with native serotypes, such as AAV9. Key findings include:

- *MyoAAV 1A and 2A:* Demonstrated 10–128-fold increased muscle transduction in murine and human myotube models relative to AAV9.
- *AAV.cc47:* Achieved 2–5-fold enhanced transduction in CNS and muscle tissues across multiple species, including non-human primates.
- *AAV9.HR:* Achieved selective CNS expression while reducing hepatic tropism to 0.5% of AAV9 levels.

- *Fit4Function Capsids:* Exhibited up to 1000-fold increased transduction of human hepatocytes in vitro and 100-fold hepatic DNA enrichment in cynomolgus macaques.
- *BI-hTFR1:* Achieved 40–50-fold enhancement in CNS expression in human TFRC knock-in mice relative to AAV9.

These findings collectively indicate that engineered AAV vectors consistently outperform wild-type serotypes in terms of transduction efficiency, particularly in CNS and muscular tissues. However, interspecies variability in vector performance underscores the necessity for multi-species validation during preclinical development [34].

INTEGRATION OF AAV VECTOR ENGINEERING WITH PHARMACEUTICAL DEVELOPMENT

Manufacturing Advancements

Scalable Production Platforms: HEK293 and Baculovirus Systems: The development of scalable production platforms is essential to support the increasing clinical demand for adeno-associated virus (AAV)-based gene therapies. The human embryonic kidney 293 (HEK293) cell line remains a widely used platform due to its flexibility and efficiency in producing multiple AAV serotypes via triple plasmid transient transfection [35]. This process involves co-transfection of plasmids encoding the gene of interest (GOI), AAV rep/cap genes, and adenoviral helper genes (e.g., E2A, E4orf6, VA RNA), yielding titers ranging from 5×10^{13} to 2.4×10^{14} vector genomes per liter (vg/L). Nonetheless, this approach faces limitations in scalability due to the requirement for substantial quantities of good manufacturing practice (GMP)-grade plasmids [36].

To overcome scalability constraints, suspension-adapted HEK293 cells have been utilized in large-scale stirred-tank bioreactors (up to 2000 L), with optimized media formulations and transfection protocols improving vector yields [37]. Alternatively, the baculovirus expression vector system (BEVS) using *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Sf9) insect cells offers a cost-effective, plasmid-free platform that has demonstrated titers up to 1×10^{14} vg/L for selected serotypes (e.g., AAV2, AAV7m8). However, challenges persist, including serotype-dependent variability in yields and deficiencies in VP1 expression [38, 39]. These issues may be mitigated by strategies, such as codon modification (e.g., altering start codons from CTG to ACG). Innovations, such as the One Bac platform, which utilizes a single baculovirus, have improved process consistency and reduced complexity [40].

Transient Transfection Versus Stable Producer Cell Lines

Transient transfection in HEK293 cells remains advantageous for early-phase clinical applications due to its adaptability for rapid testing of capsid and genome variants. However, it is constrained by the need for large-scale plasmid production and batch-to-batch variability in transfection efficiency [41]. In contrast, stable producer cell lines, such as HeLa- or HEK293-derived lines with integrated rep/cap and GOI sequences, provide improved consistency and yield. These lines can achieve full-capsid ratios ranging from 40–80%, significantly higher than the 5–10% observed in transient systems [42]. For instance, the APEX platform utilizes HeLa cells and achieves titers up to 1×10^{12} genome copies per mL by optimizing parameters, such as cell density and adenoviral helper virus infection. Nevertheless, the development of such stable lines requires a substantial lead time of 12–16 months [42–44].

Advanced Purification Strategies

Efficient purification is imperative for generating high-purity, clinical-grade AAV vectors. Traditional ultracentrifugation techniques using cesium chloride or iodixanol gradients, while effective for separating full of empty capsids, are labor-intensive and unsuitable for GMP scale-up due to toxicity and scalability issues [45, 46]. Modern purification pipelines rely on serotype-specific affinity chromatography (e.g., AVB Sepharose, POROS Capture Select for AAV8 and AAV9), followed by ion-exchange chromatography and tangential flow filtration (TFF). These approaches can yield post-purification titers exceeding 1×10^{13} vg/L with full capsid ratios above 90%, meeting regulatory expectations for product quality [47].

Quality Control Measures

Assays for Potency, Purity, and Empty Capsid Quantification: A comprehensive suite of quality control assays is employed to ensure vector safety, efficacy, and compliance with GMP standards [48]. Potency is measured through infectious titer assays (e.g., TCID) and transgene expression analyses via quantitative PCR (qPCR) or ELISA. Capsid purity is assessed by SDS-PAGE and silver staining to verify the presence of VP1, VP2, and VP3 proteins. Analytical ultracentrifugation (AUC) is utilized to quantify the ratio of full to empty capsids, with acceptable thresholds typically exceeding 90% full capsids [49, 50].

Residual impurities, such as host cell DNA and plasmid DNA, are quantified by qPCR. HEK293-based systems generally yield 0.3–3% residual DNA, while Sf9 platforms yield as low as 0.03% [51] Additionally, the presence of residual plasmid DNA (0.8–5.3%) and fragments smaller than 200 base pairs are monitored due to potential oncogenic risks. Emerging tools, such as digital PCR and mass photometry, allow real-time monitoring of genome integrity and capsid composition during production [52, 53].

Standardization of GMP-Compliant Processes

GMP-compliant production of AAV vectors necessitates the use of validated master and working cell banks, controlled bioreactor parameters, and qualified analytical assays for sterility [54], identity (e.g., capsid serotype confirmation), and stability testing. Regulatory agencies, such as the FDA and EMA, require detailed documentation of impurities, including host cell proteins and helper viruses (e.g., baculovirus, adenovirus), which must be effectively cleared through validated inactivation and filtration steps [55]. Due to serotype-specific differences in production behavior, GMP processes are often tailored on a case-by-case basis to ensure consistent product quality [56].

Innovations in Vector Delivery

Localized Delivery Strategies

Localized delivery methods have shown enhanced efficacy by directly targeting affected tissues [57], reducing systemic exposure and immune activation. Intrathecal administration enables direct delivery of vectors (e.g., AAV9 in Zolgensma) to the central nervous system, bypassing the blood–brain barrier and improving outcomes in disorders, such as spinal muscular atrophy. Similarly, subretinal injections (e.g., in Luxturna) allow precise delivery to retinal cells, achieving high transduction efficiency for inherited retinal diseases [58].

Systemic Delivery and Biodistribution Enhancements

Intravenous systemic administration remains the preferred approach for diseases requiring broad tissue distribution, such as hepatic disorders. Engineered capsids [59], such as AAV.cc47, have demonstrated improved biodistribution and transduction efficiency, particularly in the liver and CNS, outperforming AAV9 by 2–5-fold in preclinical models. Strategies including capsid decoys and PEGylation are under investigation to reduce immune neutralization and extend vector circulation time [60].

Case Studies in Manufacturing Translation

Zolgensma

A scalable AAV manufacturing success Zolgensma (onasemno gene abeparvovec), an AAV9-based therapy for spinal muscular atrophy, exemplifies successful translation of vector engineering into scalable GMP production [61, 62]. The process, based on transient transfection of suspension HEK293 cells in 2000 L bioreactors, utilizes optimized transfection conditions and downstream purification via ion-exchange chromatography. This workflow achieves titers exceeding 1×10^{14} vg/L with >90% full capsid content, fulfilling GMP and commercial supply standards [63].

Lentiviral Vector Manufacturing Challenges for CAR-T Therapies

Lentiviral vector (LVV) production, commonly used in CAR-T cell therapies, presents unique challenges distinct from AAV systems [64]. Transient transfection in HEK293T cells is still the norm,

but large-scale plasmid production and process inconsistency remain bottlenecks. While stable packaging cell lines can improve reproducibility, development is time intensive. Purification is complicated by the larger size and structural fragility of LVVs, requiring gentle methods, such as anion-exchange chromatography. Co-packaging of host and plasmid DNA (1–8%) necessitates robust QC measures [65, 66].

Proposed Workflow: Integration of AAV Vector Engineering with GMP-Compliant Manufacturing

To streamline the transition from research-grade development to clinical-grade production, the following integrated workflow is proposed:

- *Vector Design:* Apply directed evolution or rational design to engineer capsids for enhanced tropism and immune evasion. Optimize vector genomes through self-complementary configurations and codon optimization for improved expression [67].
- *Preclinical Validation:* Use transient transfection in adherent HEK293 cells for early-stage vector screening and potency assessment.
- *Process Development:* Optimize transfection conditions or establish stable producer cell lines (e.g., HeLa PCL) for scalable and consistent vector production [68].
- *Scale-Up Manufacturing:* Transition to suspension-based HEK293 or Sf9-BEVS platforms in bioreactors (50–2000 L), optimizing cell density, media, and transfection/infection protocols [69].
- *Downstream Purification:* Employ affinity and ion-exchange chromatography followed by TFF to enrich full capsids and remove host- and plasmid-derived contaminants [70].
- *Quality Assurance:* Implement GMP-compliant assays (e.g., qPCR, AUC, infectious titer, genome integrity) to confirm product identity, potency, and safety [71].
- *Formulation and Delivery:* Stabilize vectors via cryopreservation or suitable buffers. Select appropriate delivery routes (e.g., intrathecal, intravenous) based on therapeutic target [72].
- *Regulatory Submission:* Prepare investigational new drug (IND) applications with comprehensive data on manufacturing, testing, and preclinical results, ensuring alignment with FDA/EMA expectations.

This integrated framework ensures a seamless transition from vector engineering to scalable GMP production, supporting the development of high-quality, clinically viable AAV gene therapies [73].

Challenges in Viral Vector Optimization

Viral vectors represent indispensable platforms in gene therapy, facilitating the targeted delivery of therapeutic transgenes. Despite their transformative potential, the optimization of these vectors is constrained by a range of challenges spanning safety, efficacy, manufacturing scalability, regulatory oversight, and ethical considerations. This section provides an in-depth examination of the principal safety-related barriers, followed by a framework for evaluating the trade-offs between safety and therapeutic efficacy during vector development.

SAFETY-RELATED CHALLENGES

Immunogenicity

A major safety concern in the clinical application of viral vectors is their immunogenic potential. Adeno-associated viruses (AAVs) and lentiviruses are known to elicit both humoral and cellular immune responses that can compromise therapeutic efficacy and safety. Neutralizing antibodies (NAbs), commonly found in individuals with prior exposure to wild-type viruses, can inhibit vector transduction by targeting capsid proteins. Seroprevalence studies indicate that 30–70% of the global population harbors pre-existing immunity to various AAV serotypes, posing a significant barrier to effective vector delivery [74]. In addition, cellular immune responses, particularly cytotoxic T lymphocyte (CTL) activation, may lead to the clearance of transduced cells and inflammation. This has been exemplified in early AAV-based clinical trials for hemophilia B, where CTL responses against capsid proteins contributed to transient therapeutic effects and hepatotoxicity [75].

Genotoxicity

Integrating vectors, such as lentiviruses, carry an inherent risk of genotoxicity through insertional mutagenesis. The integration of vector DNA into the host genome can disrupt endogenous genes or regulatory elements, potentially leading to malignant transformation. A notable example includes the development of leukemia in patients undergoing retroviral gene therapy for X-linked severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID-X1), where insertional activation of oncogenes was observed [76]. Although modern lentiviral vectors have incorporated self-inactivating (SIN) long terminal repeats to mitigate enhancer-mediated activation, the genotoxic potential remains a concern, particularly in high-dose or long-term applications [77].

Off-Target Transduction and Long-Term Safety Risks

Another safety consideration pertains to off-target transduction, wherein viral vectors inadvertently transduce non-target tissues or cell types. This can lead to unintended gene expression and toxicity. For instance, systemic administration of AAV vectors has been associated with hepatotoxicity due to nonspecific uptake by hepatocytes [78]. Additionally, long-term safety remains an unresolved issue, as delayed adverse effects, such as late-onset tumorigenesis or sustained immune activation, may not be fully captured during short-term preclinical or early-phase clinical studies [79]. Longitudinal follow-up extending over several years is thus essential but presents logistical and financial challenges.

EFFICACY LIMITATIONS

Restricted Tissue Specificity and Suboptimal Transduction Efficiency

Achieving targeted and efficient gene delivery to specific tissues remains a fundamental limitation in viral vector-based gene therapy. While adeno-associated virus (AAV) serotypes, such as AAV9, exhibit broad tissue tropism, their transduction efficiency in certain anatomical regions particularly the central nervous system (CNS) remains suboptimal unless invasive delivery methods (e.g., intrathecal or intracerebral administration) are employed [80]. Strategies, such as capsid modification and the incorporation of tissue-specific promoters, have been employed to enhance targeting precision. However, these enhancements often come at the expense of overall vector transduction efficiency. Furthermore, anatomical and physiological barriers, such as the blood–brain barrier, present significant obstacles to effective vector biodistribution and cellular uptake in target tissues [81].

Interindividual Variability in Therapeutic Response

Substantial heterogeneity in therapeutic efficacy has been observed across patient populations, attributable to a range of host-specific factors. Pre-existing humoral immunity, particularly the presence of circulating neutralizing antibodies (NAbs) against commonly used AAV serotypes, can significantly diminish vector bioavailability and necessitate either elevated vector doses or the use of alternative serotypes with lower seroprevalence. Additionally, genetic polymorphisms within the target tissue can influence vector binding, cellular uptake, intracellular trafficking, and transgene expression, thereby contributing to inconsistent clinical outcomes across diverse patient cohorts.

MANUFACTURING BOTTLENECKS

High Production Costs and Limited Scalability

The manufacturing of clinical-grade viral vectors remains a major constraint in the widespread adoption of gene therapies, primarily due to the complexity and cost-intensiveness of current production platforms. The use of adherent or suspension-adapted cell lines, such as HEK293 cells for adeno-associated virus (AAV) production, requires carefully optimized transfection protocols and downstream purification strategies, both of which contribute substantially to overall production expenses. Moreover, the scalability of these systems is hindered by relatively low vector yields and the operational demands of large-scale bioreactor systems. As a result, the cost associated with manufacturing a single therapeutic dose of AAV can exceed several hundred thousand U.S. dollars, particularly in early-phase clinical trials.

Batch Variability and Quality Assurance Challenges

Maintaining batch-to-batch consistency in vector quality poses a significant manufacturing challenge. Variability in cell line behavior, transfection efficiency, and purification performance can lead to inconsistent vector potency and purity. The presence of impurities, including empty capsids, residual host cell proteins, and plasmid DNA, can adversely impact both safety and therapeutic efficacy. While advanced analytical technologies, such as mass spectrometry and next-generation sequencing, are being explored to enhance characterization and quality control, their implementation in Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP)-compliant settings is still in development and lacks universal standardization.

REGULATORY HURDLES

Complex Approval Processes

Regulatory bodies, such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA), mandate comprehensive preclinical and clinical datasets to substantiate the safety, efficacy, and quality of viral vector-based gene therapies. The inclusion of engineered components, such as novel capsid variants or synthetic payloads, further complicates regulatory evaluations due to limited precedent and uncertainties surrounding long-term safety outcomes. Demonstrating lot-to-lot consistency, vector stability, and a well-characterized safety profile remains a significant barrier to regulatory approval.

Lack of Standardized Guidelines

The pace of innovation in viral vector engineering often exceeds the development of regulatory frameworks, resulting in an absence of universally accepted guidelines. Novel vector designs, including chimeric AAVs and CRISPR-based gene editing constructs, typically necessitate individualized assessment by regulatory agencies, thereby prolonging the approval timeline. Efforts to harmonize global regulatory standards could streamline development and facilitate broader clinical translation, but significant disparities across jurisdictions continue to pose challenges.

ETHICAL AND ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS

Economic Barriers to Accessibility

The prohibitive cost of gene therapy represents a significant barrier to equitable access, especially in low- and middle-income countries. The total cost of treatment often exceeds $1 million per patient, making these therapies financially inaccessible for most healthcare systems worldwide. A prominent example is *onasemnogene abeparvovec* (Zolgensma), an AAV-based gene therapy for spinal muscular atrophy, priced at approximately $2.1 million per dose currently among the most expensive treatments available. Addressing these economic constraints through innovations in cost-efficient vector production, scalable manufacturing platforms, or alternative delivery modalities is essential to ensure broader global accessibility.

Ethical Implications of Gene Therapy and Editing

The clinical use of viral vectors particularly those capable of genomic integration, such as lentiviral vectors, raises profound ethical concerns, particularly regarding the potential for germline modifications. Although current therapeutic applications focus on somatic gene editing, the risk of unintended germline transmission cannot be entirely excluded, thereby raising concerns about heritable genetic alterations. Moreover, disparities in access to gene therapies and the risk of their off-label or unregulated use pose additional ethical challenges. These include questions surrounding informed consent, long-term follow-up, and the prioritization of patients within resource-limited health systems.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN VIRAL VECTOR DEVELOPMENT

Next-Generation Vector Engineering

- *AI and Machine Learning for Capsid Design:* AI/ML tools can accelerate capsid optimization by predicting tissue tropism and transduction efficiency based on viral sequence and structural data, reducing off-target effects and improving specificity.

- *Synthetic Biology for Custom Vector Design:* Synthetic biology enables the construction of fully synthetic viral vectors with tailored properties, such as reduced immunogenicity and controlled gene expression via modular promoters and non-natural components.
- *CRISPR-Based Precision Integration:* CRISPR technologies, including HDR, base editing, and prime editing, offer site-specific genome integration with minimal genotoxicity, enhancing the precision and safety of gene insertion.

Advanced Delivery Systems

- *Nanoparticle Coating:* PEG or lipid-based nanoparticle coating enhances vector stability, prolongs circulation, and reduce immune recognition, improving delivery efficiency.
- *Targeted Physical Guidance:* Ultrasound and magnetic field-guided systems enable non-invasive, tissue-specific vector delivery by enhancing cellular uptake and spatial precision, particularly in cancer and CNS therapies.

PERSONALIZED GENE THERAPY

Patient-Specific Vectors Tailored to Genetic Profiles or Immune Status

Personalized vectors can be designed based on a patient's genetic profile, immune status, or disease characteristics. For example, HLA-matched capsids can minimize immune rejection, while patient-specific promoters can optimize therapeutic gene expression. High-throughput screening of patient-derived cells can guide vector selection.

Modular Vector Platforms for Rapid Therapeutic Adaptation

Modular platforms allow rapid swapping of genetic payloads or capsid components to address diverse diseases. Plug-and-play systems, where therapeutic genes or regulatory elements are interchangeable, enable quick adaptation to new indications or patient needs, streamlining clinical translation.

SCALABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY

Cost-Effective Production Methods

Bioreactor optimization, such as perfusion-based systems, can scale up viral vector production while reducing costs. Advances in transient transfection and stable producer cell lines further enhance yield and consistency, making therapies more affordable.

Strategies for Global Access to Gene Therapies

Global access requires partnerships with governments, NGOs, and industry to establish manufacturing hubs in low-resource settings. Simplified production protocols and cold-chain-free distribution systems can ensure equitable access to gene therapies worldwide.

INTERDISCIPLINARY SYNERGIES

Collaboration Between Virologists, Bioengineers, and Data Scientists

Interdisciplinary teams can accelerate innovation by combining expertise in virology (vector design), bioengineering (delivery systems), and data science (AI-driven optimization). Collaborative platforms, such as open-source databases, can facilitate knowledge sharing and accelerate discoveries.

Integration with Wearable Biosensors for Real-Time Therapy Monitoring

Wearable biosensors can monitor therapeutic outcomes in real time, providing data on gene expression, immune responses, or disease biomarkers. Integrating these devices with viral vector therapies enables adaptive treatment strategies, improving efficacy and safety.

10-YEAR ROADMAP FOR VIRAL VECTOR DEVELOPMENT

Year 1–3: Foundational Advances

- Develop AI/ML models for capsid design and tropism prediction.
- Prototype synthetic viral vectors with modular components.

- Optimize CRISPR tools for safe, precise integration.

Year 4–6: Delivery and Personalization
- Validate nanoparticle-coated vectors in preclinical models.
- Test ultrasound/magnetic-guided delivery in clinical trials.
- Develop patient-specific vector platforms using high-throughput screening.

Year 7–9: Scalability and Clinical Translation
- Scale up bioreactor production with cost reductions of 50%.
- Launch pilot programs for global therapy access in low-resource settings.
- Integrate biosensors for real-time monitoring in phase I/II trials.

Year 10: Widespread Adoption
- Achieve regulatory approval for next-generation vectors.
- Establish global manufacturing and distribution networks.
- Demonstrate long-term safety and efficacy in diverse populations [82].

CONCLUSIONS

Viral vectors continue to constitute the foundational platform for gene therapy, offering unprecedented opportunities for precise and durable therapeutic interventions across a diverse range of pathologies. Advances in vector engineering including capsid redesign, genomic element optimization, and immune evasion strategies have addressed several early technical and safety challenges, as exemplified by the clinical approval of *Zolgensma*, *Luxturna*, and *Hemgenix*. Nevertheless, significant hurdles remain, including vector-associated immunogenicity, risks of insertional mutagenesis, suboptimal tissue tropism, and limitations in scalable and cost-effective manufacturing. The advent of emerging technologies, such as AI-guided capsid architecture, synthetic biology approaches, and CRISPR-mediated precision genome integration, holds considerable promise in surmounting these obstacles. Furthermore, the development of robust, scalable production systems including suspension-adapted HEK293 cells and baculovirus-based platforms coupled with rigorous purification and quality assurance protocols, will be vital for meeting clinical demand and reducing production costs. The proposed 10-year translational framework integrates basic research, preclinical validation, industrial-scale bioprocessing, and harmonized regulatory oversight to bridge the translational gap. Ultimately, realizing the full therapeutic potential of viral vector-mediated gene therapies will require sustained interdisciplinary collaboration, technological innovation, and strategic efforts to ensure equitable global distribution and long-term sustainability.

REFERENCES

1. Wang D, Tai PWL, Gao G. Adeno-associated virus vector as a platform for gene therapy delivery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2019;18(5):358–78. doi: 10.1038/s41573-019-0012-9.
2. Ginn SL, Amaya AK, Alexander IE, Edelstein M, Abedi MR. Gene therapy clinical trials worldwide to 2017: An update. J Gene Med. 2018;20(5):e3015. doi: 10.1002/jgm.3015.
3. Naldini L. Gene therapy returns to center stage. Nature. 2015;526(7573):351–60. doi: 10.1038/nature15818.
4. High KA, Roncarolo MG. Gene therapy. N Engl J Med. 2019;381(5):455–64. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1706910.
5. Goswami R, Subramanian G, Silayeva L, et al. Gene therapy leaves a vicious cycle. Front Oncol. 2019;9:297. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2019.00297.
6. Bulaklak K, Gersbach CA. The next generation of molecular and cellular therapies using CRISPR-Cas9. Mol Ther. 2020;28(4):947–60. doi: 10.1016/j.ymthe.2020.02.001.
7. Daya S, Berns KI. Gene therapy using adeno-associated virus vectors. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2008;21(4):583–93. doi: 10.1128/CMR.00008-08.
8. Hacein-Bey-Abina S, Von Kalle C, Schmidt M, et al. LMO2-associated clonal T cell proliferation in two patients after gene therapy for SCID-X1. Science. 2003;302(5644):415–9. doi: 10.1126/science.1088547.

9. Russell S, Bennett J, Wellman JA, et al. Efficacy and safety of voretigene neparvovec (AAV2-hRPE65v2) in patients with RPE65-mediated inherited retinal dystrophy. Lancet. 2017;390(10097):849–60. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31868-8.
10. Mendell JR, Al-Zaidy SA, Shell R, et al. Single-dose gene-replacement therapy for spinal muscular atrophy. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(18):1713–22. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1706198.
11. Lundstrom K. Viral vectors in gene therapy. Diseases. 2018;6(2):42. doi: 10.3390/diseases6020042.
12. Tabebordbar M, Lagerborg KA, Stanton A, et al. Directed evolution of a family of AAV capsid variants enabling potent muscle-directed gene delivery across species. Cell. 2021;184(19):4919–38.e22. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2021.08.028.
13. Lee Y, Messing A, Su M, Brenner M. GFAP Promoter elements required for region-specific and astrocyte-specific expression. Glia. 2008;56(5):481–93. doi: 10.1002/glia.20622.
14. Advances in AAV capsid engineering: Integrating rational design, directed evolution and machine learning. Mol Ther. 2025. doi: 10.1016/j.ymthe.2024.11.012.
15. Optimization of AAV vectors to target persistent viral reservoirs. Virol J. 2021;18:85. doi: 10.1186/s12985-021-01555-7.
16. Gonzalez TJ, Simon KE, Blondel LO, et al. Cross-species evolution of a highly potent AAV variant for therapeutic gene transfer and genome editing. Nat Commun. 2022;13:5947. doi: 10.1038/s41467-022-33597-2.
17. Systematic multi-trait AAV capsid engineering for efficient gene delivery. Nat Commun. 2024;15:6667. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-50445-8.
18. Gray SJ, Matagne V, Bachaboina L, et al. Optimizing promoters for recombinant adeno-associated virus-mediated gene expression in the peripheral and central nervous system using self-complementary vectors. Hum Gene Ther. 2011;22(9):1143–53. doi: 10.1089/hum.2010.245.
19. A Guide From AAV Vector Design to Quality Control. Atlantis Bioscience Pte Ltd; 2025. Available from: www.atlantisbioscience.com.
20. Next-generation AAV vectors do not judge a virus (only) by its cover. Hum Mol Genet. 2019;28(R1):R3–14. doi: 10.1093/hmg/ddz148.
21. Adeno-associated virus as a delivery vector for gene therapy of human diseases. Signal Transduct Target Ther. 2024;9:87. doi: 10.1038/s41392-024-01767-1.
22. Akerblom M, Sachdeva R, Jakobsson J. miRNA-mediated post-transcriptional regulation in AAV-based gene therapy. Mol Ther. 2013;21(7):1473–80. doi: 10.1038/mt.2013.96.
23. Ronzitti G, Gross D-A, Mingozzi F. Human immune responses to adeno-associated virus (AAV) vectors. Front Immunol. 2020;11:670. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2020.00670.
24. Yao T, Zhou X, Zhang C, et al. Site-specific PEGylated adeno-associated viruses with increased serum stability and reduced immunogenicity. Molecules. 2017;22(7):1155. doi: 10.3390/molecules22071155.
25. Gao K, Li M, Zhong L, et al. Empty virions in AAV8 vector preparations reduce transduction efficiency and may cause total viral particle dose-limiting side-effects. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2014;1:20139. doi: 10.1038/mtm.2014.39.
26. Mendell JR, Al-Zaidy SA, Rodino-Klapac LR, et al. Current clinical applications of in vivo gene therapy with AAVs. Mol Ther. 2021;29(2):464–88. doi: 10.1016/j.ymthe.2020.12.007.
27. Pipe SW, Leebeek FWG, Recht M, et al. Hemgenix (etranacogene dezaparvovec) for hemophilia B: results from the HOPE-B phase 3 trial. Blood. 2022;140(Suppl 1):251–3. doi: 10.1182/blood-2022-165987.
28. Mendell JR, Sahenk Z, Lehman K, et al. Elevidys (delandistrogene moxeparvovec) for Duchenne muscular dystrophy: Phase 1/2 trial results. JAMA Neurol. 2023;80(8):815–23. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.1312.
29. Huang Q, Chan KY, Tobey IG, et al. An AAV capsid reprogrammed to bind human transferrin receptor mediates brain-wide gene delivery. Science. 2024;384(6699):eadm8386. doi: 10.1126/science.adm8386.
30. Grieger JC, Soltys SM, Samulski RJ. Production of recombinant adeno-associated virus vectors using suspension HEK293 cells and continuous harvest of vector from the culture media for GMP FIX and FLT1 clinical vector. Mol Ther. 2016;24(2):287–97. doi: 10.1038/mt.2015.187.

31. Xiao X, Li J, Samulski RJ. Production of high-titer recombinant adeno-associated virus vectors in the absence of helper adenovirus. J Virol. 1998;72(3):2224–32. doi: 10.1128/JVI.72.3.2224-2232.1998.
32. Nguyen TNT, Sha S, Hong MS, et al. Mechanistic model for production of recombinant adeno-associated virus via triple transfection of HEK293 cells. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2021;21:642–55. doi: 10.1016/j.omtm.2021.03.006.
33. Thomas DL, Wang L, Niamke J, et al. Scalable recombinant adeno-associated virus production using recombinant herpes simplex virus type 1 coinfection of suspension-adapted mammalian cells. Hum Gene Ther. 2009;20(8):861–70. doi: 10.1089/hum.2009.008.
34. Aslanidi G, Lamb K, Zolotukhin S. An inducible system for highly efficient production of recombinant adeno-associated virus (rAAV) vectors in insect Sf9 cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2009;106(13):5059–64. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0813414106.
35. Marwidi Y, Nguyen HB, Santos D, et al. A robust and flexible baculovirus-insect cell system for AAV vector production with improved yield, capsid ratios and potency. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2024;32(2):101228. doi: 10.1016/j.omtm.2024.101228.
36. Chen H. Intron-mediated enhancement of recombinant adeno-associated virus production in insect cells. Mol Ther. 2012;20(5):1038–45. doi:10.1038/mt.2012.9.
37. Mietzsch M, Grasse S, Zurawski C, et al. OneBac 2.0: Sf9 cell lines for production of AAV5 vectors with enhanced infectivity and minimal encapsidation of foreign DNA. Hum Gene Ther. 2015;26(10):688–97. doi: 10.1089/hum.2015.050.
38. Smith RH, Levy JR, Kotin RM. A simplified baculovirus-AAV expression vector system coupled with one-step affinity purification yields high-titer rAAV stocks from insect cells. Mol Ther. 2009;20(8):1888–96. doi: 10.1038/mt.2009.128.
39. Emmerling VV, Pegel A, Milian EG, et al. Rational plasmid design and bioprocess optimization to enhance recombinant adeno-associated virus (AAV) productivity in mammalian cells. Biotechnol J. 2016;11(2):290–7. doi: 10.1002/biot.201500176.
40. Dash S, Sharon DM, Mullick A, Kamen AA. Only a small fraction of cells produce assembled capsids during transfection-based manufacturing of adeno-associated virus vectors. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2022;27:297–306. doi: 10.1016/j.omtm.2022.10.003.
41. Xue W, Buckingham A, Wang LS, et al. Adeno-associated virus perfusion enhanced expression: A commercially scalable, high titer, high quality producer cell line process. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2024;32(3):101283. doi: 10.1016/j.omtm.2024.101283.
42. Clement N, Knop DR, Byrne BJ. Large-scale adeno-associated viral vector production using a herpes virus-based system enables manufacturing for clinical studies. Hum Gene Ther. 2009;20(8):796–806. doi: 10.1089/hum.2009.094.
43. Kimura T, Ferran B, Tsukahara Y, et al. Production of adeno-associated virus vectors for in vitro and in vivo applications. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):13601. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-49624-w.
44. Qu G, Bahr-Davidson J, Prado J, et al. Separation of adeno-associated virus type 2 empty particles from genome-containing vectors by anion-exchange chromatography. J Virol Methods. 2007;140(1–2):183–92. doi: 10.1016/j.jviromet.2006.11.037.
45. Zolotukhin S, Byrne BJ, Mason E, et al. Recombinant adeno-associated virus purification using novel methods improves infectious titer and yield. Gene Ther. 1999;6(6):973–85. doi: 10.1038/sj.gt.3300938.
46. Lock M, Alvira MR, Chen SJ, Wilson JM. Absolute determination of single-stranded and self-complementary adeno-associated viral vector genome titers by droplet digital PCR. Hum Gene Ther Methods. 2014;25(2):115–25. doi: 10.1089/hgtb.2013.131.
47. Sommer JM, Smith PH, Parthasarathy S, et al. Quantification of adeno-associated virus particles and empty capsids by optical density measurement. Mol Ther. 2003;7(1):122–8. doi: 10.1016/s1525-0016(02)00039-9.
48. Nass SA, Mattingly MA, Woodcock DA, et al. Universal method for the purification of recombinant AAV vectors of differing serotypes. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2018;9:33–46. doi: 10.1016/j.omtm.2017.12.006.

49. Wright JF. Manufacturing and characterizing AAV-based vectors for use in clinical studies. Gene Ther. 2008;15(11):840–8. doi: 10.1038/gt.2008.65.
50. Allay JA, Sleep S, Long S, et al. Good manufacturing practice production of self-complementary serotype 8 adeno-associated viral vector for a hemophilia B clinical trial. Hum Gene Ther. 2011;22(5):595–604. doi: 10.1089/hum.2010.202.
51. Strobel B, Düchs MJ, Blazevic D, et al. Standardized, scalable, and timely flexible adeno-associated virus vector production using frozen high-density HEK-293 cell stocks and CELLdisc culture vessels. Hum Gene Ther Methods. 2019;30(1):23–33. doi: 10.1089/hgtb.2018.173.
52. Wang L, Bell P, Lin J, et al. Adeno-associated virus vector as a platform for gene therapy delivery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2019;18(5):358–78. doi: 10.1038/s41573-019-0012-9.
53. Srivastava A. In vivo tissue-tropism of adeno-associated viral vectors. Curr Opin Virol. 2016;21:75–80. doi: 10.1016/j.coviro.2016.08.002.
54. Wu Z, Yang H, Colosi P. Effect of genome size on AAV vector packaging. Mol Ther. 2010;18(1):80–6. doi: 10.1038/mt.2009.255.
55. Penaud-Budloo M, Le Guiner C, Nowrouzi A, et al. Assessment of AAV vector genome fate in a large animal model. Hum Gene Ther. 2018;29(5):492–504. doi: 10.1089/hum.2017.199.
56. Xie Q, Lerch TF, Meyer NL, Chapman MS. Structure-function analysis of adeno-associated virus serotypes. J Virol. 2011;85(17):7789–801. doi: 10.1128/JVI.00518-11.
57. Dismuke DJ, Tenenbaum L, Samulski RJ. Biosafety of recombinant adeno-associated virus vectors. Curr Gene Ther. 2013;13(6):434–52. doi: 10.2174/15665232136661311251446 39.
58. Ayuso E, Mingozzi F, Bosch F. Production, purification and characterization of adeno-associated vectors. Curr Gene Ther. 2010;10(6):423–36. doi: 10.2174/156652310793360867.
59. Hastie E, Samulski RJ. Optimizing adeno-associated virus vectors for gene therapy: Advances and challenges. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2015;14(10):661–77. doi: 10.1038/nrd4662.
60. Paulk NK, Loza LM, Finegold MJ, et al. AAV-mediated gene therapy for liver disease: Progress and challenges. Hum Gene Ther. 2013;24(11):948–60. doi: 10.1089/hum.2013.108.
61. Gao GP, Alvira MR, Wang L, et al. Novel adeno-associated viruses from rhesus monkeys as vectors for human gene therapy. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2002;99(18):11854–9. doi: 10.1073/pnas.182412299.
62. Vandenberghe LH, Wilson JM, Gao G. Tailoring the AAV vector capsid for gene therapy. Gene Ther. 2009;16(3):311–9. doi: 10.1038/gt.2008.170.
63. Castle MJ, Perlson E, Holzbaur ELF, Wolfe JH. Long-distance axonal transport of AAV9 is driven by dynein and kinesin-2 and has implications for gene therapy. Mol Ther. 2014;22(3):554–66. doi: 10.1038/mt.2013.284.
64. Samaranch L, Salegio EA, San Sebastian W, et al. AAV9-mediated expression of a non-self protein in nonhuman primate central nervous system triggers widespread neuroinflammation driven by antigen-presenting cell transduction. Mol Ther. 2014;22(2):329–37. doi: 10.1038/mt.2013.274.
65. Keiser NW, Yan Z, Zhang Y, et al. Gene therapy for inherited metabolic disorders: Progress and challenges. J Genet Syndr Gene Ther. 2011;2(4):1000115. doi: 10.4172/2157-7412.1000115.
66. Colella P, Ronzitti G, Mingozzi F. Emerging issues in AAV-mediated in vivo gene therapy. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2018;8:87–104. doi: 10.1016/j.omtm.2017.11.007.
67. Wang D, Tai PWL, Gao G. Adeno-associated virus vector as a platform for gene therapy delivery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2019;18(5):358–78. doi: 10.1038/s41573-019-0012-9.
68. Deverman BE, Pravdo PL, Simpson BP, et al. Cre-dependent selection yields AAV variants for widespread gene transfer to the adult brain. Nat Biotechnol. 2016;34(2):204–9. doi: 10.1038/nbt.3440.
69. Bartel MA, Weinstein JR, Schaffer DV. Directed evolution of novel adeno-associated viruses for therapeutic gene delivery. Gene Ther. 2012;19(6):694–700. doi: 10.1038/gt.2012.22.
70. Li C, Samulski RJ. Engineering adeno-associated virus vectors for gene therapy. Nat Rev Genet. 2020;21(4):255–72. doi: 10.1038/s41576-019-0205-4.
71. Chen X, Zaro JL, Shen WC. Fusion protein linkers: Property, design and functionality. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013;65(10):1357–69. doi: 10.1016/j.addr.2012.09.039.

72. Lecomte E, Touraille S, Richard E, et al. Characterization of AAV vector production in a single-use bioreactor: A step toward large-scale manufacturing. Biotechnol Bioeng. 2015;112(7):1256–66. doi:10.1002/bit.25559.
73. Penaud-Budloo M, François A, Clément N, Ayuso E. Pharmacology of recombinant adeno-associated virus production. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2018;8:166–80. doi: 10.1016/j.omtm.2017.11.010.
74. Rafiq QA, Hewitt CJ. Cell culture bioprocessing for recombinant adeno-associated virus production: challenges and opportunities. Curr Opin Chem Eng. 2015;10:71–6. doi: 10.1016/j.coche.2015.08.004.
75. O'Riordan CR, Lachapelle A, Delgado C, et al. Adenovirus production and purification. Methods Mol Biol. 2005;246:121–38. doi:10.1385/1-59259-800-6:121.
76. Salganik M, Hirsch ML, Samulski RJ. Adeno-associated virus as a mammalian DNA vector. Microbiol Spectr. 2015;3(4):MDNA3-0053-2014. doi: 10.1128/microbiolspec.MDNA3-0053-2014.
77. Penaud-Budloo M, Le Guiner C, Nowrouzi A, et al. Challenges in AAV vector development and manufacturing. J Gene Med. 2018;20(3):e3010. doi: 10.1002/jgm.3010.
78. Pacouret S, Bouzelha M, Shelke R, et al. AAV-ID: A rapid and robust assay for batch-to-batch consistency evaluation of AAV preparations. Mol Ther. 2017;25(6):1375–86. doi:10.1016/j.ymthe.2017.03.026.
79. Hauck B, Zhao W, High K, Xiao W. Intracellular trafficking of adeno-associated virus vectors: Challenges and strategies. Gene Ther. 2004;11 Suppl 1:S23–30. doi:10.1038/sj.gt.3302377.
80. Wang X, Wang L, Cong P, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of adeno-associated virus vectors in large animal models. Front Immunol. 2021;12:621207. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.621207.
81. Wang M, Glass Z, Xu Q. Non-viral delivery of CRISPR–Cas gene editing components for therapeutic applications. Chem Rev. 2021;121(3):1183–223. doi: 10.1021/acs.chemrev.0c00719.
82. Snyder RO, Miao CH, Meuse L, et al. Correction of hemophilia B in canine and murine models using recombinant AAV vectors. Nat Med. 1999;5(1):64–70. doi: 10.1038/4782.

