REVIEW

Toll‐like receptors as novel therapeutic targets for herpes simplex virus infection

Rana Jahanban-Esfahlan^{1,2} D | Khaled Seidi³ | Maryam Majidinia⁴ D | Ansar Karimian⁵ D | Bahman Yousefi^{6,7} \bullet | Seyed Mohammad Nabavi⁸ \bullet | Akram Astani⁹ \bullet | Ioana Berindan-Neagoe^{10,11,12} **D** ∣ Diana Gulei¹⁰ D ∣ Francesca Fallarino¹³ D ∣ Marco Gargaro¹³ | Giorgia Manni¹³ | Matteo Pirro¹⁴ | Suowen Xu¹⁵ | Marco Gargaro¹³ | Suowen Xu¹⁵ Mahmoud Sadeghi¹⁶ | Seyed Fazel Nabavi⁸ | Samira Shirooie¹⁷ | ®

⁴ Solid Tumor Research Center, Urmia University of Medical Sciences, Urmia, Iran

- ⁵ Cellular and Molecular Biology Research Center, Health Research Institute, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Babol, Iran
- ⁶ Molecular Medicine Research Center, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran
- 7Department of Biochemistry and Clinical Laboratories, Faculty of Medicine, Tabriz University of Medical Science, Tabriz, Iran
- ⁸ Applied Biotechnology Research Center, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
- 9Department of Microbiology, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran
- 10 MEDFUTURE -Research Center for Advanced Medicine, "Iuliu-Hatieganu" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
- ¹¹ Research Centerfor Functional Genomics, Biomedicine and Translational Medicine, "Iuliu-Hatieganu" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Cluj‐Napoca, Romania
- 12 Department of Functional Genomics and Experimental Pathology, The Oncology Institute "Prof. Dr. Ion Chiricuță", Cluj-Napoca, Romania
- ¹³ Department of Experimental Medicine, University of Perugia, Italy
- ¹⁴ Department of Medicine, University of Perugia, Italy
- ¹⁵ Aab Cardiovascular Research Institute, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, USA
- ¹⁶ Department of Transplantation Immunology, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
- ¹⁷ Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

Correspondence

Bahman Yousefi, Molecular Medicine Research Center, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran.

Email: yousefib@tbzmed.ac.ir

Seyed Mohammad Nabavi, Applied Biotechnology Research Center, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, PO Box 19945‐546. Email: nabavi208@gmail.com

Summary

Seropositivity for HSV reaches more than 70% within the world population, and yet no approved vaccine exists. While HSV1 is responsible for keratitis, encephalitis, and labialis, HSV2 carriers have a high susceptibility to other STD infections, such as HIV. Induction of antiviral innate immune responses upon infection depends on a family of pattern recognition receptors called Toll‐like receptors (TLR). TLRs bridge innate and adaptive immunity by sensing virus infection and activating antiviral immune responses. HSV adopts smart tricks to evade innate immunity and can also manipulate TLR signaling to evade the immune system or even confer destructive effects in favor of virus replication. Here, we review mechanisms by which HSV can trick TLR signaling to impair innate immunity. Then, we analyze the role of HSV‐mediated molecular cues, in particular, NF‐κB signaling, in promoting protective versus destructive effects of TLRs. Finally, TLR‐based therapeutic opportunities with the goal of preventing or treating HSV infection will be discussed.

 1 Department of Medical Biotechnology, Faculty of Advanced Medical Sciences, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran

 2 Drug Applied Research Center, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran

³ Immunology Research Center, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran

 $\frac{2 \text{ of 14}}{2 \text{ of 14}}$ MII FV—
3 JAHANBAN-ESFAHLAN ετ AL.

KEYWORDS

herpes simplex virus (HSV) infection, novel therapeutic targets, Toll-like receptors (TLR)

1 | INTRODUCTION

Herpes simplex virus serotypes 1 (HSV1) and 2 (HSV2) frequently cause oral-facial, ocular, or genital mucosa infections.¹ Ocular HSV1 infections mostly affect the cornea, leading to corneal scarring, keratitis, and even blindness. HSV1 infection can also cause encephalitis, which may be fatal.

As one of the most prevalent sexually transmitted infections (STI), the prevalence of genital HSV2 differs (16%‐97%) depending on age, sex, ethnicity, culture, geographic location, and other factors. In addition, primary HSV2 infection transmitted to the newborn is associated with high morbidity and mortality.² Following initial genital infection, HSV2 forms a life‐long latency in the sacral ganglia and occasionally reactivates to establish genital lesions.³ Moreover, these genital lesions favor acquisition of other STIs, in particular, human immunodeficiency virus type 1 $(HIV1)⁴$ Shedding of HSV2 from the genital tract is recurrent and asymptomatic.⁵ Intermittent antiviral therapy can suppress current infections while prophylactic use can prevent further relapses. No vaccines to give protection against HSV have been approved.⁶ Nevertheless, there have been some positive clinical achievements. For example, in a recent preclinical study, an HSV2 trivalent subunit vaccine containing glycoproteins C, D, and E (gC2, gD2, and gE2) showed immunogenicity in rhesus macaques and displayed more than 97% efficacy in guinea pigs.^{6,7} Also, results from a phase III clinical trial study showed that a recombinant glycoprotein D vaccine, conferred approximately 74% prevention of genital HSV disease in women seronegative for both HSV serotypes.⁸

A family of innate immune receptors, namely, Toll‐like receptors (TLR) is responsible for induction of antiviral innate immune responses by recognizing virus infection and inducing a spectrum of signaling pathways, which leads to the production of proinflammatory cytokines, chemokines, and interferons. Moreover, TLRs activate antigen presenting cells (APCs) to work in concert with adaptive immunity for infection eradication and establishment of long-term immunity.⁹ There are 10 TLRs in humans numbered consecutively (1‐10). Ligands for TLRs are single‐stranded RNA (ssRNA) viruses for TLR7/8 and dsRNA viruses for TLR3, CpG DNA for TLR9, envelope glycoproteins for TLR2, lipopolysaccharide (LPS) of gram-negative bacteria for TLR4 and flagellin for TLR5.¹⁰ Other distinct classes of pattern recognition receptors (PRRs), which work with TLRs include RNA helicase retinoic acid-inducible gene (RIG I), the NOD-like receptors (NLRs), RIG-I-like receptors (RLRs)/MDA5, the AIM2 inflammasome, the pyrin and HIN200 domain-containing (PYHIN) protein¹¹ IFI16 and UNC93B1.12

HSV1 infection involves modulation of several TLRs, in particular TLR2/3/9, and the presence or absence of TLR2 is critical to the survival of mice with HSV1 infection.¹³ Meanwhile, cytoplasmic

recognition of dsRNA by RNA helicases such as RIG I and MDA5 provides another means of recognizing viral nucleic acid.¹⁴ TLR9 and RLRs activate distinctly and/or overlapping innate mechanisms, which leads to efficient viral sensing and production of type I IFNs after HSV infection.15

Earlier studies recognized numerous HSV‐encoded functions that impede antiviral host immunity including ICP0-mediated suppression of cytokine/interferon response,¹⁶ nonspecific degradation of host mRNA by the virion host shut-off (VHS) RNase,¹⁷ inhibition of PKR by US11 and¹⁸ γ34.5, inhibition of MHC-I peptide loading¹⁹ by ICP47, and modulation of $TLRs.$ ¹¹ In addition, recent data show that HSV1 incorporates a human protein, the DEAD‐box ATP‐dependent RNA helicase (DDX3X) to stimulate HSV1 gene expression and, consequently, virion assembly without inducing interferon production.²⁰ Other studies define the contribution of microRNAs in herpes simplex encephalitis (HSE), as it is shown that the 75% to 80% of mice with a deficiency of miR‐155 are highly susceptible to HSE after ocular infection with $HSV1²¹$ Also, miR-H6 encoded from HSV1 genome can engage ICP4 to block HSV1 replication and sustain latency.²²

Besides activating the innate immune response, TLRs also shape the adaptive immune response toward protective or destructive effects. In response, HSV can manipulate TLR signaling toward avoidance of immune responses or even exploit it for its own benefit. Here, we review mechanisms by which HSV tricks TLR signaling to impair innate immunity, and we also analyze the role of HSV‐mediated molecular cues, in particular, NF‐κB signaling in promoting protective versus destructive effects of TLRs. Finally, TLR‐based therapeutic opportunities with the goal of preventing or treating HSV infection will be discussed.²³

2 | TLRS: STRUCTURE, LOCALIZATION, AND LIGANDS

TLRs are trans‐membrane horseshoe‐shaped proteins that identify ligands from pathogenic (viral and microbial products) and commensal organisms, as well as endogenous ligands originating from injured cells.²⁴ The structure of TLRs consists of three domains: ligand recognition domain at the cell surface or inside the cytoplasm, a single transmembrane domain, and the intra‐cytoplasmic TIR domain, which binds to the adaptor proteins.²⁵

TLR family members number 10 in human (TLRs 1‐10) and 12 in the mouse (TLR1‐9 and TLR11‐13). While TLR1/2/4/5/6/10 are located extracellularly, TLR3/7/8/9 are located in the cytoplasm (within endosome) and recognize nucleic acids produced during viral infections.²⁶ Also, glycoproteins are recognized by TLR2, doublestranded RNA (dsRNA) by TLR3, ssRNA by TLR7/8, CpG DNA by TLR9, LPS by TLR4, and flagellin²⁷ by TLR5.

Upon ligand binding, TLR homodimerization (all TLRs except TLR2) or heterodimerization (TLR2) can be switched on by ligation of the TIR domains of two neighboring TLRs, an event that further promotes conformational changes required for activation of the downstream signaling cascade. Heterodimers of TLR2 with TLR6 or TLR1 can form, where the ligand specificity for each dimer will be different.¹ TLRs may also employ coreceptors for full ligand sensitivity, for example, TLR4 recognition of LPS, requires the cooperation of CD14, MD2, and LPS-binding protein (LBP).²⁸ Also, intracellular cascades call for binding of extra adaptor proteins including the myeloid differentiation factor 88 (MyD88), the TIR domain‐containing adaptor protein inducing interferon‐β (TRIF/TICAM), MyD88 adaptor‐like protein (Mal/ TIRAP), and the TRIF‐related adaptor molecule (TRAM). While most TLRs recruit one or two adapters, TLR4 employs all of the four adaptor proteins (Figure 1). Negative regulators of TLR function include the Toll‐interacting protein (Tollip), the B cell adaptor for PI3K (BCAP), and IRAK-M.¹¹

3 | TLR SIGNALING PATHWAYS

As shown in Figure 1, the TLR adaptor protein MyD88 is central to signaling cascade mediated by TLR1/2/5/6/7/8/9, but it is not needed for TLR3‐dependent signal transduction events. MyD88 recruits the serine/threonine IL1R-associated protein 4 and 1 (IRAK4/1 and IRAK1) and activates tumor necrosis factor receptor‐associated factor 6 (TRAF6). Then, the signal transduces to TGFβ‐activated kinase 1 (TAK1), TAK1‐binding proteins 1, 2, or 3 (TAB1/2/3), phosphorylation of IkB kinases (IKKs), and dissociation of inhibitor B (IκBα) from NFκB. Further, NFκB proteins translocate to the nucleus and trigger inflammatory cytokine gene expression in cooperation with the family of

mitogen‐activated protein kinase (MAPK) and activator protein‐1 (AP‐1).29 Signal transduction via TLR7/8/9 also activates MyD88‐ mediated signaling events through interferon regulatory factor 7 (IRF7), which leads to type I interferon (INFα, INFβ) responses. Both TLR2 and TLR4 utilize a second adapter, TIRAP (Mal) for NF‐κB activation. TLR3, which is the main contributor to IFN production, utilizes TRIF instead of MyD88. TRIF signaling through receptor‐interacting protein 1 (RIP1) or tank binding protein 1 (TBK1) leads to NF‐κB or IRF3 activation, respectively. TLR4 also interacts with TRIF, through the fourth adapter protein, TRAM.³⁰

4 | HSV STRUCTURE AND LIFE CYCLE

Nuclear‐replicating HSV 1 and 2 belong to the herpes virus family, sharing a similar structure with large double‐stranded DNA covered by tegument proteins (Figure 2). The linear and GC‐rich genomic DNA contains approximately 80 viral genes, which are organized as unique long (UL) and unique short (US) segments. 31 The nucleocapsid and tegument proteins are wrapped in a glycoprotein‐studded lipid envelope, which mediates attachment and entry into target cells. After fusion and entry into the host cell, virus is transported to the nucleus by microtubule transport machinery or endocytosis. Subsequently, virus DNA is released from the capsid into the nucleus to initiate the process of viral gene expression, genome replication, virion assembly, and release of new infectious virus. 27 Three classes of HSV1 genes; immediate early (IE), early, and late are expressed in a sequential manner, and IE genes regulate expression of early genes and late genes. Epithelial or mucosal cells are the primary targets of initial infection after which the virus can form latent infection in sensory ganglia.³² There is a role for noncoding short RNAs, namely, microRNAs

4 of 14 JAHANBAN-ESFAHLAN ET AL.

FIGURE 2 Scheme of HSV structure and life cycle

(miRNAs) in HSV latency, because lytic gene expression, IC50 is suppressed by miR‐H2, which is completely complementary to ICP0 mRNA.¹⁶ These small sequences are able to regulate the process of gene expression through direct binding of the coding mRNA sequences and further translational impairment.³³⁻³⁵

5 | TLR SIGNALING PATHWAYS AND HSV INFECTION

HSV infection elicits a vigorous innate reaction by activating the secretion of a wide panel of chemokines, interferons, and proinflammatory cytokines, involving TLR2, TLR3, and TLR9 or cytosolic RIG I in a Toll-independent manner.^{32,36} Several molecular constituents of HSV are capable of activating an innate response, including (a) glycoproteins recognized by TLR2, (b) HSV DNA containing unmethylated CpG motifs detected via TLR9‐dependent or non‐TLR DNA sensors, and (c) dsRNA and ssRNA recognized by TLR3 and TLR7/8, respectively 37 (Figure 3).

Activation of TLR2 via HSV1-encoded envelope glycoproteins (gB, gC, gD, gE, gH, gL) activates NF‐κB via MyD88/TRAF6‐dependent signaling pathway^{6,8,38} whereas activation of TLR9 by virus DNA (CpG oligodeoxynucleotides (ODN) leads to expression 39 of IFN type I. Likewise, recognition of dsRNA by TLR3 induces type I IFN‐ mediated antiviral immunity against a number of viral infections. As such, purified HSV2 DNA is shown to trigger IFNα secretion from plasmacytoid dendritic cells (pDCs) and that inhibitory CpG oligonucleotide treatment diminishes HSV‐induced IFNα secretion by pDCs in a dose‐dependent manner, showing that genomic DNA of a virus

can engage TLR9 and result in the secretion of IFNα by pDCs.^{39,40} Similarly, HSV-1 can induce IFN β , via the⁴¹ PYHIN protein IFI16. Moreover, induction of type III interferon (INFλ) contributes to TLR3‐mediated HSV1 inhibition in astrocytes and human cervical epithelial cells.^{42,43} Dual recognition of HSV by innateToll system offers an advantage since HSV contains multiple pathogen‐associated molecular patterns. As a proof of concept, dendritic cells (DCs) that express multiple TLRs can recognize TLR2 and TLR9 in an orchestrated sequence and can induce IL6 and IL12 secretion from bone marrow-derived DCs.⁴⁴ Other studies identified the critical role of TLR2 and TLR9 expressed in trigeminal ganglia for viral control during HSV1 infection.⁴⁵ Augmented TLR3/9 gene expression upon stimulation with HSV1 DNA and HSV‐ anti‐HSV IgG complexes results in vigorous IL6 release from infected corneal cells.⁴⁶ Importantly, impaired TLR3 and UNC-93B-dependent IFNα/β intrinsic immunity to HSV1 in the CNS, in neurons and oligodendrocytes, explains the pathogenesis of HSE in children.⁴⁷

6 | TLR SIGNALING: FOR OR AGAINST HSV INFECTION

TLR2‐mediated cytokine response to HSV1 is detrimental to the host, particularly within the brain. TLR activation is described as a double‐ edged sword since it may either diminish or exacerbate disease, depending on the pathogen and infection site. In this section, we review current knowledge in the context of beneficial versus detrimental effects of HSV‐mediated TLR signaling.

In the case of HSV1, the induction of a TLR2‐mediated cytokine response in the brain contributes to lethal encephalitis and the death

FIGURE 3 Implication of Toll-like receptor signaling during HSV infection. HSV ligands are shown in purple, while theraputic ligands as Toll-like receptor (TLR) modulators are shown in light blue

of the animal.48 Sepsis syndrome that is seen with HSV infection in neonates can be explained by host responses, as contrary to the predictions, neonates produce more proinflammatory cytokines than adults do. This is in line with the finding that TLR2‐deficient mice are more likely to survive HSV1 challenge than wild-type (WT) mice.⁴⁹ Another study indicates that HSV‐induced expression of inflammatory cytokines by astrocytes, microglial cells, monocytes, and neutrophils is largely facilitated by TLR2 in the central nervous system (CNS). TLR2 induces microglial cell death and apoptosis as a natural defense mechanism to eradicate HSV-infected cells.⁵⁰ Besides apoptosis, TLR2 signaling generates ROS and induction of oxidative stress, which facilitates secondary tissue damage during CNS infection and HSE‐neurotoxicity. In concordance with this notion, stimulation with HSV1 elevates intracellular ROS and induces more neuronal oxidative damage in WT microglial cell cultures, compared with TLR2‐/‐microglia, which show a late and lessened ROS formation, reduced p42/p44 ERK and p38 MAPK activation and less cytotoxicity to cultured neurons after viral infection.⁵¹

In contrast to the destructive effects of TLR2 signaling in HSE, the absence of TLR9 does not impact type I IFN levels, survival rate, or viral replication in the brain following infection, though presence of type I IFNs are protective and absolutely required for survival following intracranial HSV1 infection.^{52,53} Surprisingly, other studies describe a protective effect against HSV infection when TLR2/9 works together. As such, TLR2 and TLR9 synergistically fuel innate antiviral events to control HSV infection in the brain,¹³ and the low expression of TLR2 and TLR9 in the periphery defines the susceptibility to HSV1 entry into the nervous system.⁵⁴

The effects of TLR3 seem to be protective, as in HSV1‐infected cultured mouse neural stem cells (NSCs), HSV‐1 infection leads to upregulated expression of TLR3 and the phosphorylation level of IRF3 in the nucleus to induce IFNβ expression. These effects were abrogated after RNAi-mediated blocking of TLR3.⁵⁵ Similarly, TLR3 immune deficiency results in HSV2-associated mollaret meningitis.⁵⁶ Likewise, TLR3 deficiency renders astrocytes permissive to HSV infection and accelerates CNS infection in mice.⁵⁷ Moreover, HSV1 Us3 gene product dampens innate immunity by blocking TLR3 responses in the U937 cultured monocytic cell.⁵⁸ Deficiency in TLR-related adaptor molecules, for example, human TRAF3 is another contribution to impaired TLR3 response and susceptibility to HSE.⁵⁹

7 | HSV IMPAIRS TLR SIGNALING AND EVADES IMMUNE CELL RECOGNITION

Herpes viruses usurp different molecular cues to impair host sensing of the pathogen and retard clearance of HSV‐infected cells. In recent years, manipulation of TLR signaling by HSV proteins has come to light. It appears that HSV‐mediated TLR signaling mainly modulates NF-кB signaling in a way to benefit virus replication while simultaneously endowing suppression of interferon production. It is worth mentioning that the omnipresent NF‐κB signaling activates transcription of the key modules of innate feedbacks to viral infection including cytokines, chemokines, adhesion, as well as antiapoptotic proteins. Interestingly, in the case of NF‐κB, HSVs modulate NF‐κB through numerous viral gene products. That is, HSV not only impairs TLR‐ mediated NF‐κB signaling but can also activate/inhibit NF‐κB by its own proteins in a TLR‐independent manner to ensure productive infections and immune escape (Table 1).

TABLE 1 Mechanisms employed by HSV to modulate TLR signaling

Recently, a screen of the US regions of HSV2 identified the gene product of US2 to positively modulate NF‐κB signaling and cytokine production via ligation⁷² to TAK1. Conversely, HSV immediate early protein ICP0 interaction with the USP7 (HAUSP) elicits opposite effects on TLR‐induced NF‐κB signaling. USP7 encodes deubiquitination of IKKγ and TRAF6, which operate downregulation of TLR dependent‐NF‐κB and subsequent inflammatory mediators. These data pinpoint the negative regulatory role of USP7 in Toll signaling, and HSV ICP0 seizes this potential to counteract innate responses during HSV infection.⁷⁰ Likewise, HSV UL37 tegument protein can induce NF‐κB without engaging TLR2. The cellular transfection of UL37 was associated with endogenous expression of IL8 gene and subsequent IκB degradation. This activation required TRAF6, and surprisingly, UL37 appears to contain a TRAF6‐binding domain.⁷¹

Other studies have discovered that TLR9‐dependent pathways are harnessed by HSV. In this regard, result from one study verified that corneal endothelial (HCEn) cells expressed abundant intracellular level of TLR9 and that the TLR9 ODN, provoked the NF‐κB activity in these

cells, comparable with HSV1 infection, which also stimulated NF‐κB and NF‐κB‐related inflammatory cytokines, including IP10 (CCL5), CXCL10, monocyte chemoattractant protein‐2 (MCP2 known as CCL8), macrophage migration inhibitory factor (MIF), MCP4 (CCL13), MDC (CCL22), MIP3α (CCL20), IL5, TARC (CCL17), and MCP1 (CCL2). Blocking the activity of TLR9 not only significantly reduced the levels of these cytokines but it also inhibited viral replication in HCEn cells, which was restored by a simultaneous NF‐κB activation. HCEn cells ignite transcriptional activation of inflammatory actions in response to HSV1 infection including NF-кВ, the CCAAT-enhancerbinding proteins (C/EBP), cyclic AMP response element (CRE), plus a series of TLR9-dependent inflammatory cytokines. Alternatively, HSV1 usurps the TLR9-NFKB axis for virus replication.⁶⁸

Recent research illuminates how NF‐κB activity is synchronized by HSV to favor immune escape during the very early phase of viral infection. HSV infected cell protein 27 (HSV1 ICP27), an IE protein of HSV1, represses rather than activates NF-KB activity by ligating to IkBα, and Daxx, blocking phosphorylation and ubiquitination of IkBα and thus stabilizing IkBα.⁷³

HSV can block activation of innate immunity by direct suppression of TLR signaling. As such, HSV1 dysregulates antifungal defenses, which downregulates TLR2 and avoids monocyte activation.⁶⁷ Likewise, HSV US3 tegument protein inhibits TLR2 signaling at or before TRAF6 ubiquitination.⁶⁵ Another mechanism for HSV ICP0 inhibitory potential on TLR2‐driven NF‐κB signaling is via degradation of adaptor proteins and IRF3. ICP0 alone can counteract TLR2‐evolved responses to either viral or nonviral ligand upstream of p65 and at or downstream of MyD88. ICP0 expression alone can also dampen the MyD88 and TIRAP levels.⁶⁹ HSV ICP0 is also shown to recruit USP7 to suppress NF‐κB and JNK activation and TLR2/TLR4 mediated innate response.⁷⁰ Also, HSV1 Us3 can interfere with the TLR3 sensing of HSV‐related ligands and subsequent induction of type I IFN inducible MxA protein levels by type I IFN in monocytic cells.⁵⁸ Likewise, OASL1 deficiency increases antiviral immunity toward genital HSV2 infection by improving type I interferon expression of IRF7. Oasl1(‐/‐) mice displayed superior survival rates, suppressed virus replication, enhanced production of type I IFNs, and cytotoxic T cell responses including IFNγ production than WT mice following intravaginal HSV2 infection.74

8 | TLR-BASED THERAPEUTIC OPPORTUNITIES FOR HSV

HSV has favorable biological features that can be employed to fight viral infection. Two tactics can be envisioned as (a) developing HSV‐ based vectors (amplicons) and (b) TLR modulators using either HSV amplicons or TLR ligands with agonistic, antagonistic, or adjuvant capabilities (Figure 4).

8.1 | Herpes simplex virus‐based vectors (amplicons)

Natural neurotropism has led to the development of HSV‐based vectors for neuronal gene delivery. Now, versatile and high titer HSV‐based gene vectors are designed and implemented in the therapeutic and prophylactic settings to attack infectious diseases and can $cer⁷⁵⁻⁷⁸$ possibly improving the efficiency of gene targeted molecules like naked si RNA^{79} or even serving for new generation genome editing tools like CRISPR/Cas.⁸⁰

As a versatile gene transfer platform, the replication-defective HSV1 amplicon has gained significance because of its amenability to genetic manipulation, its widespread cellular tropism, extensive transgene capacity, and minimal immunogenicity. 81 There are two types of vectors: amplicon vectors, which are plasmids wrapped into HSV particles using a helper virus and replication‐defective viruses, which are nontoxic forms of virus due to deletion of viral genes.⁸² Numerous studies have revealed a significant role of innate immune responses induced by virus vectors in activation of inflammatory responses and the control of transgenic expression.⁸³⁻⁸⁵ Thanks to the HSV amplicons, we can study innate molecular cues stimulated by the entry of HSV1 particles without expression of the viral gene. 31 In this respect, HSV1 amplicon vectors as gene transfer agents and potential to carry costimulatory genes such as CD80 (B7.1) or CD154 (CD40L) have shown promising results in immunotherapy of chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL). The results of one study noted that, although the transduction efficacy of two vectors were similar, surprisingly, HSV amplicon vectors that were packaged using a helper virus (H +‐HSV) or without it (HF‐HSV) showed opposing effects on CLL B cells. Adjuvant immunostimulatory and potent anti‐CLL response was associated with the HF‐HSV, whereas H+‐HSV displayed an immunosuppressive activity, which inhibited the development of

FIGURE 4 Toll-like receptor (TLR)-based therapeutic opportunities for HSV

8 of 14 WILEY MEET AL.

×

TABLE 2 TLRs based HSV drugs

TABLE 2 (Continued)

antitumor T-cell immunity.⁸⁶ Also, HSV1-based amplicon vectors have identified the presence of activation pathways for the virus, which work independently of TLR and rely on IRF3/7 activation. Infection of human fibroblasts with amplicons confers antiviral response via significant upregulation of TLR3, IRF7, and IFN‐stimulated genes (ISGs), rendering HSV‐cells immune to virus infection and vesicular stomatitis virus.⁸⁷

8.2 | TLR modulators

Efficient immune responses require close interaction between the innate and adaptive immunity and TLRs play a fundamental role by linking these two systems together. The innate immune system not only reacts promptly to environmental insult or microbial infection but also instructs and activates APCs to produce cytokines for T cell polarization toward a proper effector phenotype.⁸⁸ Through appropriate antigen presentation, only mature DCs will be able to stimulate differentiation of naive T cells into effector T cells. The pattern of cytokines induced by the TLR engagement will determine the type of effector T cells.⁸⁹ Thus, TLR seems an ideal target to treat/avoid/protect a wide spectrum of immune‐related disease/infections.

TLR-based HSV therapy with natural/synthetic compounds or gene therapy using amplicon vectors entails three modalities including agonists, inhibitors (antagonist), and adjuvant therapy to achieve a therapeutic/protective index (Table 2).

8.3 | Agonists (competitive inhibitors of HSV)

Agonists act as competitive inhibitors for HSV to bind to TLRs. Poly I:C, ssRNA, virus glycoproteins, and attenuated virus (containing mutant genes) are examples of ligands, which have been successfully employed in preclinical and clinical settings.¹⁰³ Agonist therapy can control infection at the very early stage since they can block virus attachment to the cell surface via TLR2 or they can block TLR9‐ mediated activation of NFκB signaling by virus. Additionally, since agonists block the interaction of virus with TLRs, they may suppress deleterious effects of TLR2 in response to HSV as seen in HSE cases.

The antiviral activity of low-molecular-weight mannogalactofucans (LMMGFs) illustrates its potential as a potent TLR2 agonist. LMMGFs enhance TLR2 mRNA expression and stimulate the phosphorylation of Akt and JNK in Vero cells. LMMGFs inhibit viral entry and also exhibit inhibitory activity directly against viral particles. These results clearly demonstrated that LMMGFs use TLR2 as their receptor, preventing HSV1 infection on the host cell surface and antagonizing viral adsorption via TLR2 pathway activation in Vero cells.⁹⁸ Also, defective viruses can be employed as agonists with vaccine potential. Recombinant HSV1 with a mutation in the gamma134.5 protein, a virulence factor, can stimulate DC maturation (CD11⁺) via activation of TBK1 and sequential phosphorylation of IRF3 and p65/RelA. Immunizations with the gamma134.5 induce immune responses and protect mice against lethal challenge by WT virus. Additionally, mutant virusactivated DCs elicit immunity upon adoptive transfer.⁹⁶

8.4 | Inhibitors of TLRs and NF‐kB signaling

Inhibitors of TLRs significantly inhibit virus replication by interfering with NF-кB signaling at an early stage of virus infection. For example, treatment with a five adjacent guanosine residues (G‐ODN) at a concentration of 10 to 20 μM 2 hours before infection inhibited TLR9 signaling, NF‐κB activity and substantially reduced the yield of lytic virus (90%) in herpes-susceptible cells. Also, the TLR9 inhibitory effect of CpG oligonucleotide was associated with downregulation of crucial immediate early HSV proteins, impaired viral attachment and entry, virucide activity and mitigated virus replication.⁹⁵ Equally, an additional study using both agonists (TLR 3/9) and inhibitors (TLR9) of TLRs demonstrated an increased survival rate of mice when agonists of TLR3 polyinosinic: polycytidylic acid (PIC) and TLR9 (type B ODN 1826) were administered intranasally prior to HSV1 infection. In contrast, the results of antagonist therapy were positive when TLR9 inhibitor ODN 2088 was given after viral infection. Interestingly, posttreatment with PIC conferred opposite effects and was translated into an aggravated HSE compared with the control. These observations

were possibly due to the stimulatory effect of agonist therapy on early production of type I IFN to reduce viral load in the brain whereas the encouraging effects of antagonist therapy on HSE survival rate was related to the diminished expression of inflammatory mediators such as CCL5, TNFα, and IL6 post infection.102

8.5 | Adjuvants (vaccines)

Given the potential of TLR agonists to bring innate and adaptive immunity together by activating APCs such as immature DCs to mature DCs and conferring effective Th1(CD4+) and Th2 (CD8+) and INFγ responses, TLR agonists can indeed make good adjuvants as well.¹⁰⁴ In one clinical report of a phase III clinical trial, gD2-AS04 containing HSV2 glycoprotein D2 and aluminum hydroxide and 3‐O‐deacylated monophosphoryl lipid A (MPL) was successful as a TLR4-based vaccine.¹⁰⁵ Correspondingly, resiquimod, a TLR7/8 agonist, is capable of inducing cytokine production to stimulate an antigen‐specific Th1‐acquired immune response, which adjusts HSV infection in vivo. Also, resiquimod 0.01% gel reduced human anogenital HSV2 mucosal reactivation. 94 A complete list of other TLR‐based immune modulators of HSV infection, and their mechanism of action is provided in Table 2.

9 | CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

With regards to their potential to delicately fine-tune the immune response, TLRs are excellent candidates for eliminating viral infections. Nevertheless, precautions should be taken into consideration, and knowledge about the role of molecular cues, which determine protective versus detrimental effects of TLRs can help to optimize TLR therapy. Thus, extra attention should be devoted to new drugs that can encourage substantial and longstanding immunity, while concurrently easing unwanted effects. An understanding of how precise constituents of HSV induce and/or prevent innate immunity would open the door for rational design of gene therapy vectors and TLR modulators explicitly personalized for specific clinical applications. Natural/synthetic TLR modulators combined with HSV amplicon vectors would be advantageous to boost innate immunity for vaccination means, while their potential to inhibit TLR‐NF‐kB signaling is optional to avoid the unwelcome inflammatory responses as described in HSE cases.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Some portions of Figures 1 to 3 are adopted from the [https://smart.](https://smart.servier.com) [servier.com](https://smart.servier.com). The Iranian authors would like to thank Clinical Research Development Unit, Shohada Hospital, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences for kind supports.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no competing interest.

ABBREVIATIONS

ORCID

Rana Jahanban-Esfahlan <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5119-252X> Maryam Majidinia <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9776-5816> Ansar Karimian <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7541-6970> Bahman Yousefi D<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4220-1527> Seyed Mohammad Nabavi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8859-5675> Akram Astani D<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6915-1320> Ioana Berindan‐Neagoe <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5828-1325> Diana Gulei <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3030-8626> Francesca Fallarino <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8501-2136> Marco Gargaro <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0645-9800> Giorgia Manni D<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5697-2648> Matteo Pirro <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5527-4821> Suowen Xu[®] <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5488-5217> Mahmoud Sadeghi <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0994-895X> Seyed Fazel Nabavi <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4945-9651> Samira Shirooie <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5000-3387>

REFERENCES

- 1. Zhang J, Liu H, Wei B. Immune response of T cells during herpes simplex virus type 1 (HSV-1) infection. J Zhejiang Univ Sci B. 2017;18(4):277‐288.
- 2. Awasthi S, Mahairas GG, Shaw CE, et al. A dual‐modality herpes simplex virus 2 vaccine for preventing genital herpes by using glycoprotein C and D subunit antigens to induce potent antibody

responses and adenovirus vectors containing capsid and tegument proteins as T cell immunogens. J Virol. 2015;89(16):8497‐8509.

- 3. Tan DH, Murphy K, Shah P, Walmsley SL. Herpes simplex virus type 2 and HIV disease progression: a systematic review of observational studies. BMC Infect Dis. 2013;13(1):502.
- 4. Grewal R, Irimie A, Naidoo N, et al. Hodgkin's lymphoma and its association with EBV and HIV infection. Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci. 2018;55(2): 102‐114.
- 5. Sivarajah V, Venus K, Yudin MH, Murphy KE, Morrison SA, Tan DH. Does maternal HSV‐2 coinfection increase mother‐to‐child transmission of HIV? A systematic review. Sex Transm Infect. 2017;93(8):535‐542.
- 6. Awasthi S, Hook LM, Shaw CE, Friedman HM. A trivalent subunit antigen glycoprotein vaccine as immunotherapy for genital herpes in the guinea pig genital infection model. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2017;13(12):2785‐2793.
- 7. Awasthi S, Hook LM, Shaw CE, Pahar B, Stagray JA. An HSV‐2 trivalent vaccine is immunogenic in rhesus macaques and highly efficacious in guinea pigs. PLoS Pathog. 2017;13(1):e1006141.
- 8. Stanberry LR, Spruance SL, Cunningham AL, et al. Glycoprotein‐D‐ adjuvant vaccine to prevent genital herpes. New Engl J Med. 2002;347(21):1652‐1661.
- 9. Takeda K, Akira S. Microbial recognition by toll‐like receptors. J Dermatol Sci. 2004;34(2):73‐82.
- 10. West JA, Gregory SM, Damania B. Toll‐like receptor sensing of human herpesvirus infection. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2012;2:122.
- 11. Xagorari A, Chlichlia K. Toll‐like receptors and viruses: induction of innate antiviral immune responses. Open Microbiol J. 2008;2(1):49‐59.
- 12. Kim YM, Brinkmann MM, Paquet ME, Ploegh HL. UNC93B1 delivers nucleotide‐sensing toll‐like receptors to endolysosomes. Nature. 2008;452(7184):234‐238.
- 13. Sorensen LN, Reinert LS, Malmgaard L, Bartholdy C, Thomsen AR, Paludan SR. TLR2 and TLR9 synergistically control herpes simplex virus infection in the brain. J Immunol. 2008;181(12):8604‐8612.
- 14. Thompson AJ, Locarnini SA, Toll-like receptors, RIG-I-like RNA helicases and the antiviral innate immune response. Immunol Cell Biol. 2007;85(6):435‐445.
- 15. Finberg RW, Knipe DM, Kurt‐Jones EA. Herpes simplex virus and toll‐ like receptors. Viral Immunol. 2005;18(3):457‐465.
- 16. Pan D, Pesola JM, Li G, McCarron S, Coen DM. Mutations inactivating herpes simplex virus 1 microRNA miR‐H2 do not detectably increase ICP0 gene expression in infected cultured cells or mouse trigeminal ganglia. J Virol. 2017;91(2):e02001.
- 17. Shu M, Taddeo B, Zhang W, Roizman B. Selective degradation of mRNAs by the HSV host shutoff RNase is regulated by the U(L)47 tegument protein. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(18):E1669‐E1675.
- 18. Poppers J, Mulvey M, Khoo D, Mohr I. Inhibition of PKR activation by the proline‐rich RNA binding domain of the herpes simplex virus type 1 Us11 protein. J Virol. 2000;74(23):11215‐11221.
- 19. Orr MT, Edelmann KH, Vieira J, Corey L, Raulet DH, Wilson CB. Inhibition of MHC class I is a virulence factor in herpes simplex virus infection of mice. PLoS Pathog. 2005;1(1):e7.
- 20. Khadivjam B, Stegen C, Hogue‐Racine MA, et al. The ATP‐dependent RNA helicase DDX3X modulates herpes simplex virus 1 gene expression. J Virol. 2017;91(8):e02411.
- 21. Bhela S, Mulik S, Reddy PB, et al. Critical role of microRNA‐155 in herpes simplex encephalitis. J Immunol. 2014;192(6):2734‐2743.
- 22. Duan F, Liao J, Huang Q, Nie Y, Wu K. HSV‐1 miR‐H6 inhibits HSV‐1 replication and IL‐6 expression in human corneal epithelial cells in vitro. Clin Dev Immunol. 2012;2012:192791.

12 of 14 JAHANBAN-ESFAHLAN ET AL.

- 23. Salaun B, Romero P, Lebecque S. Toll‐like receptors' two‐edged sword: when immunity meets apoptosis. Eur J Immunol. 2007; 37(12):3311‐3318.
- 24. Takeda K, Akira S. Toll receptors and pathogen resistance. Cell Microbiol. 2003;5(3):143‐153.
- 25. Shah M, Anwar MA, Kim JH, Choi S. Advances in antiviral therapies targeting toll-like receptors. Expert Opin Investig Drugs. 2016;25(4): 437‐453.
- 26. Savva A, Roger T. Targeting toll‐like receptors: promising therapeutic strategies for the management of sepsis‐associated pathology and infectious diseases. Front Immunol. 2013;4:387.
- 27. Uematsu S, Akira S. Innate immune recognition of viral infection. Uirusu. 2006;56(1):1‐8.
- 28. Takeda K, Akira S. TLR signaling pathways. Semin Immunol. 2004; 16(1):3‐9.
- 29. Jahanban‐Esfahlan R, Mehrzadi S, Reiter RJ, et al. Melatonin in regulation of inflammatory pathways in rheumatoid arthritis and osteoarthritis: involvement of circadian clock genes. Br J Pharmacol. 2017;175(16):3230‐3238.<https://doi.org/10.1111/bph.13898>
- 30. Lester SN, Li K. Toll-like receptors in antiviral innate immunity. J Mol Biol. 2014;426(6):1246‐1264.
- 31. de Silva S, Bowers WJ. Herpes virus amplicon vectors. Viruses. 2009;1(3):594‐624.
- 32. Ma Y, He B. Recognition of herpes simplex viruses: toll‐like receptors and beyond. J Mol Biol. 2014;426(6):1133‐1147.
- 33. Gulei D, Mehterov N, Nabavi SM, Atanasov AG, Berindan‐Neagoe I. Targeting ncRNAs by plant secondary metabolites: the ncRNAs game in the balance towards malignancy inhibition. Biotechnol Adv. 2018;36(6):1779‐1799.
- 34. Redis RS, Berindan‐Neagoe I, Pop VI, Calin GA. Non‐coding RNAs as theranostics in human cancers. J Cell Biochem. 2012;113: 1451‐1149.
- 35. Braicu C, Calin GA, Berindan‐Neagoe I. MicroRNAs and cancer therapy–from bystanders to major players. Curr Med Chem. 2013; 20(29):3561‐3573.
- 36. Kaisho T, Akira S. Toll‐like receptors as adjuvant receptors. Biochim Biophys Acta. 2002;1589(1):1‐13.
- 37. Kabelitz D. Toll‐like receptors: recognition receptors of the innate immune system and target structures for therapeutical intervention. Med Monatsschr Pharm. 2012;35(7):238‐244.
- 38. Leoni V, Gianni T, Salvioli S, Campadelli‐Fiume G. Herpes simplex virus glycoproteins gH/gL and gB bind toll‐like receptor 2, and soluble gH/gL is sufficient to activate NF‐kappaB. J Virol. 2012;86(12): 6555‐6562.
- 39. Krug A, Luker GD, Barchet W, Leib DA, Akira S, Colonna M. Herpes simplex virus type 1 activates murine natural interferon-producing cells through toll‐like receptor 9. Blood. 2004;103(4):1433‐1437.
- 40. Lund J, Sato A, Akira S, Medzhitov R, Iwasaki A. Toll‐like receptor 9‐ mediated recognition of herpes simplex virus‐2 by plasmacytoid dendritic cells. J Exp Med. 2003;198(3):513‐520.
- 41. Unterholzner L, Keating SE, Baran M, et al. IFI16 is an innate immune sensor for intracellular DNA. Nat Immunol. 2010;11(11):997-1004.
- 42. Li J, Ye L, Wang X, Hu S, Ho W. Induction of interferon‐γ contributes to toll‐like receptor 3‐mediated herpes simplex virus type 1 inhibition in astrocytes. J Neurosci Res. 2012;90(2):399‐406.
- 43. Zhou L, Li JL, Zhou Y, et al. Induction of interferon‐lambda contributes to TLR3 and RIG‐I activation‐mediated inhibition of herpes simplex virus type 2 replication in human cervical epithelial cells. Mol Hum Reprod. 2015;21(12):917‐929.
- 44. Jagadeesh S, Kyo S, Banerjee PP. Genistein represses telomerase activity via both transcriptional and posttranslational mechanisms in human prostate cancer cells. Cancer Res. 2006;66(4):2107‐2115.
- 45. Lima GK, Zolini GP, Mansur DS, et al. Toll‐like receptor (TLR) 2 and TLR9 expressed in trigeminal ganglia are critical to viral control during herpes simplex virus 1 infection. Am J Pathol. 2010;177(5):2433-2445.
- 46. Hayashi K, Hooper LC, Chin MS, Nagineni CN, Detrick B, Hooks JJ. Herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV‐1) DNA and immune complex (HSV‐1‐ human IgG) elicit vigorous interleukin 6 release from infected corneal cells via toll‐like receptors. J Gen Virol. 2006;87(8):2161‐2169.
- 47. Lafaille FG, Pessach IM, Zhang SY, et al. Impaired intrinsic immunity to HSV‐1 in human iPSC‐derived TLR3‐deficient CNS cells. Nature. 2012;491(7426):769‐773.
- 48. Kurt‐Jones EA, Chan M, Zhou S, et al. Herpes simplex virus 1 interaction with toll‐like receptor 2 contributes to lethal encephalitis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2004;101(5):1315‐1320.
- 49. Kurt‐Jones EA, Belko J, Yu C, et al. The role of toll‐like receptors in herpes simplex infection in neonates. J Infect Dis. 2005;191(5): 746‐748.
- 50. Aravalli RN, Hu S, Lokensgard JR. Toll‐like receptor 2 signaling is a mediator of apoptosis in herpes simplex virus-infected microglia. J Neuroinflammation. 2007;4(1):11.
- 51. Schachtele SJ, Hu S, Little MR, Lokensgard JR. Herpes simplex virus induces neural oxidative damage via microglial cell toll‐like receptor‐ 2. J Neuroinflammation. 2010;7(1):35.
- 52. Wang JP, Bowen GN, Zhou S, et al. Role of specific innate immune responses in herpes simplex virus infection of the central nervous system. J Virol. 2012;86(4):2273‐2281.
- 53. Rasmussen SB, Sorensen LN, Malmgaard L, et al. Type I interferon production during herpes simplex virus infection is controlled by cell-type-specific viral recognition through toll-like receptor 9, the mitochondrial antiviral signaling protein pathway, and novel recognition systems. J Virol. 2007;81(24):13315‐13324.
- 54. Bereczky‐Veress B, Abdelmagid N, Piehl F, et al. Influence of perineurial cells and toll‐like receptors 2 and 9 on herpes simplex type 1 entry to the central nervous system in rat encephalitis. PLoS ONE. 2010;5(8):e12350.
- 55. Sun X, Shi L, Zhang H, Li R, Liang R, Liu Z. Effects of toll‐like receptor 3 on herpes simplex virus type‐1‐infected mouse neural stem cells. Can J Microbiol. 2015;61(3):201‐208.
- 56. Willmann O, Ahmad‐Nejad P, Neumaier M, Hennerici MG, Fatar M. Toll‐like receptor 3 immune deficiency may be causative for HSV‐2‐ associated mollaret meningitis. Eur Neurol. 2010;63(4):249‐251.
- 57. Reinert LS, Harder L, Holm CK, et al. TLR3 deficiency renders astrocytes permissive to herpes simplex virus infection and facilitates establishment of CNS infection in mice. J Clin Investig. 2012;122(4): 1368‐1376.
- 58. Peri P, Mattila RK, Kantola H, et al. Herpes simplex virus type 1 Us3 gene deletion influences toll‐like receptor responses in cultured monocytic cells. Virol J. 2008;5(1):140.
- 59. Perez de Diego R, Sancho‐Shimizu V, Lorenzo L, et al. Human TRAF3 adaptor molecule deficiency leads to impaired toll‐like receptor 3 response and susceptibility to herpes simplex encephalitis. Immunity. 2010;33(3):400‐411.
- 60. Pezda AC, Penn A, Barton GM, Coscoy L. Suppression of TLR9 immunostimulatory motifs in the genome of a gammaherpesvirus. J Immunol. 2011;187(2):887‐896.
- 61. Herman M, Ciancanelli M, Ou YH, et al. Heterozygous TBK1 mutations impair TLR3 immunity and underlie herpes simplex encephalitis of childhood. J Exp Med. 2012;209(9):1567‐1582.
- 62. Audry M, Ciancanelli M, Yang K, et al. NEMO is a key component of NF‐kappaB‐ and IRF‐3‐dependent TLR3‐mediated immunity to herpes simplex virus. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2011;128(3):610-617. $-1-4$
- 63. Siracusano G, Venuti A, Lombardo D, Mastino A, Esclatine A, Sciortino MT. Early activation of MyD88‐mediated autophagy sustains HSV‐1 replication in human monocytic THP‐1 cells. Sci Rep. 2016;6(1):31302.
- 64. Cai M, Li M, Wang K, et al. The herpes simplex virus 1-encoded envelope glycoprotein B activates NF‐κB through the toll‐like receptor 2 and MyD88/TRAF6‐dependent signaling pathway. PLoS ONE. 2013;8(1):e54586.
- 65. Sen J, Liu X, Roller R, Knipe DM. Herpes simplex virus US3 tegument protein inhibits toll‐like receptor 2 signaling at or before TRAF6 ubiquitination. Virology. 2013;439(2):65‐73.
- 66. Cotter CR, Nguyen ML, Yount JS, López CB, Blaho JA, Moran TM. The Virion host shut‐off (vhs) protein blocks a TLR‐independent pathway of herpes simplex virus type 1 recognition in human and mouse dendritic cells. PLoS ONE. 2010;5(2):e8684.
- 67. Cermelli C, Orsi CF, Ardizzoni A, et al. Herpes simplex virus type 1 dysregulates anti‐fungal defenses preventing monocyte activation and downregulating toll-like receptor-2. Microbiol Immunol. 2008;52(12):575‐584.
- 68. Takeda S, Miyazaki D, Sasaki S, et al. Roles played by toll‐like receptor‐9 in corneal endothelial cells after herpes simplex virus type 1 infection. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2011;52(9):6729‐6736.
- 69. van Lint AL, Murawski MR, Goodbody RE, et al. Herpes simplex virus immediate-early ICP0 protein inhibits toll-like receptor 2-dependent inflammatory responses and NF‐kappaB signaling. J Virol. 2010; 84(20):10802‐10811.
- 70. Daubeuf S, Singh D, Tan Y, et al. HSV ICP0 recruits USP7 to modulate TLR‐mediated innate response. Blood. 2009;113(14):3264‐3275.
- 71. Liu X, Fitzgerald K, Kurt‐Jones E, Finberg R, Knipe DM. Herpesvirus tegument protein activates NF‐κB signaling through the TRAF6 adaptor protein. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008;105(32): 11335‐11339.
- 72. Lu X, Huang C, Zhang Y, et al. The Us2 gene product of herpes simplex virus 2 modulates NF‐kappaB activation by targeting TAK1. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):8396.
- 73. Kim JA, Choi MS, Min JS, et al. HSV‐1 ICP27 represses NF‐kappaB activity by regulating Daxx sumoylation. BMB Rep. 2017;50(5): 275‐280.
- 74. Oh JE, Lee MS, Kim YJ, Lee HK. OASL1 deficiency promotes antiviral protection against genital herpes simplex virus type 2 infection by enhancing type I interferon production. Sci Rep. 2016;6(1):19089.
- 75. Shen Y, Nemunaitis J. Herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV‐1) for cancer treatment. Cancer Gene Ther. 2006;13(11):975‐992.
- 76. Yura Y. Presage of oncolytic virotherapy for oral cancer with herpes simplex virus. Jpn Dent Sci Rev. 2017;53(2):53‐60.
- 77. Uchida H, Hamada H, Nakano K, et al. Oncolytic herpes simplex virus vectors fully retargeted to tumor‐associated antigens. Curr Cancer Drug Targets. 2018;18(2):162‐170.
- 78. Fountzilas C, Patel S, Mahalingam D. Review: oncolytic virotherapy, updates and future directions. Oncotarget. 2017;8(60): 102617‐102639.
- 79. Braicu C, Pileczki V, Irimie A, Berindan‐Neagoe I. p53siRNA therapy reduces cell proliferation, migration and induces apoptosis in triple negative breast cancer cells. Mol Cell Biochem. 2013;381(1‐2):61‐68.
- 80. Gulei D, Berindan-Neagoe I. CRISPR/Cas9: a potential life-saving tool. What's next? Mol Ther Nucleic Acids. 2017;9:333‐336.
- 81. Epstein AL. HSV-1-based amplicon vectors: design and applications. Gene Ther. 2005;12(S1):S154‐S158.
- 82. Lachmann RH. Herpes simplex virus-based vectors. Int J Exp Pathol. 2004;85(4):177‐190.
- 83. Zeier Z, Aguilar JS, Lopez CM, et al. A limited innate immune response is induced by a replication-defective herpes simplex virus vector following delivery to the murine central nervous system. J Neurovirol. 2009;15(5‐6):411‐424.
- 84. Wakimoto H, Johnson PR, Knipe DM, Chiocca EA. Effects of innate immunity on herpes simplex virus and its ability to kill tumor cells. Gene Ther. 2003;10(11):983‐990.
- 85. Brockman MA, Knipe DM. Herpes simplex virus vectors elicit durable immune responses in the presence of preexisting host immunity. J Virol. 2002;76(8):3678‐3687.
- 86. Tolba KA, Bowers WJ, Hilchey SP, et al. Development of herpes simplex virus‐1 amplicon‐based immunotherapy for chronic lymphocytic leukemia. Blood. 2001;98(2):287‐295.
- 87. Tsitoura E, Thomas J, Cuchet D, Thoinet K, Mavromara P, Epstein AL. Infection with herpes simplex type 1‐based amplicon vectors results in an IRF3/7‐dependent, TLR‐independent activation of the innate antiviral response in primary human fibroblasts. J Gen Virol. 2009; 90(9):2209‐2220.
- 88. Kaisho T, Akira S, Toll-like receptors and their signaling mechanism in innate immunity. Acta Odontol Scand. 2001;59(3):124‐130.
- 89. Dowling JK, Mansell A. Toll-like receptors: the swiss army knife of immunity and vaccine development. Clin Transl Immunol. 2016;5(5): e85.
- 90. Odegard JM, Flynn PA, Campbell DJ, et al. A novel HSV‐2 subunit vaccine induces GLA‐dependent CD4 and CD8 T cell responses and protective immunity in mice and guinea pigs. Vaccine. 2016;34(1): 101‐109.
- 91. Zhou L, Li J, Wang X, et al. IL-29/IL-28A suppress HSV-1 infection of human NT2‐N neurons. J Neurovirol. 2011;17(3):212‐219.
- 92. Bernstein DI, Cardin RD, Bravo FJ, et al. Topical SMIP‐7.7, a toll‐like receptor 7 agonist, protects against genital herpes simplex virus type‐2 disease in the guinea pig model of genital herpes. Antivir Chem Chemother. 2014;23(5):189‐196.
- 93. Zhou Y, Ye L, Wan Q, et al. Activation of toll-like receptors inhibits herpes simplex virus-1 infection of human neuronal cells. J Neurosci Res. 2009;87(13):2916‐2925.
- 94. Mark KE, Corey L, Meng TC, et al. Topical resiquimod 0.01% gel decreases herpes simplex virus type 2 genital shedding: a randomized, controlled trial. J Infect Dis. 2007;195(9):1324‐1331.
- 95. Sauter MM, Gauger JJL, Brandt CR. Oligonucleotides designed to inhibit TLR9 block herpes simplex virus type 1 infection at multiple steps. Antiviral Res. 2014;0;109:83‐96.
- 96. Ma Y, Chen M, Jin H, Prabhakar BS, Valyi‐Nagy T, He B. An engineered herpesvirus activates dendritic cells and induces protective immunity. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):41461.
- 97. Rose WA 2nd, McGowin CL, Pyles RB. FSL-1, a bacterial-derived tolllike receptor 2/6 agonist, enhances resistance to experimental HSV‐2 infection. Virol J. 2009;6(1):195.
- 98. Kim WJ, Choi JW, Jang WJ, et al. Low‐molecular weight mannogalactofucans prevent herpes simplex virus type 1 infection via activation of toll-like receptor 2. Int J Biol Macromol. 2017; 103:286‐293.
- 99. Kuang L, Deng Y, Liu X, Zou Z, Mi L. Effects of a traditional Chinese medicine, longdanxiegan formula granule, on toll‐like receptor pathway in female guinea pigs with recurrent genital herpes. Taiwan J Obstet Gynecol. 2016;55(2):220‐228.

14 of 14 JAHANBAN‐ESFAHLAN ET AL.

- 100. Hensel MT, Marshall JD, Dorwart MR, et al. Prophylactic herpes simplex virus 2 (HSV‐2) vaccines adjuvanted with stable emulsion and toll-like receptor 9 agonist induce a robust HSV-2-specific cell‐mediated immune response, protect against symptomatic disease, and reduce the latent viral reservoir. J Virol. 2017;91(9): e02257.
- 101. Boivin N, Sergerie Y, Rivest S, Boivin G. Effect of pretreatment with toll‐like receptor agonists in a mouse model of herpes simplex virus type 1 encephalitis. J Infect Dis. 2008;198(5):664‐672.
- 102. Boivin N, Menasria R, Piret J, Boivin G. Modulation of TLR9 response in a mouse model of herpes simplex virus encephalitis. Antiviral Res. 2012;96(3):414‐421.
- 103. Krishnan J, Lee G, Choi S. Drugs targeting toll‐like receptors. Arch Pharm Res. 2009;32(11):1485‐1502.
- 104. Bhardwaj N, Gnjatic S, Sawhney NB. TLR agonists: are they good adjuvants? Cancer J. 2010;16:382‐391.
- 105. Leroux‐Roels G, Clement F, Vandepapeliere P, Fourneau M, Heineman TC, Dubin G. Immunogenicity and safety of different formulations of an adjuvanted glycoprotein D genital herpes vaccine in healthy adults: a double-blind randomized trial. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2013;9(6):1254‐1262.

How to cite this article: Jahanban‐Esfahlan R, Seidi K, Majidinia M, et al. Toll‐like receptors as novel therapeutic targets for herpes simplex virus infection. Rev Med Virol. 2019;29: e2048. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rmv.2048>