BULLETIN OF ADVANCED DRUG DELIVERY AND THERAPEUTICS
Content Available at www.saap.org.in
(Online Peer-Reviewed, Referred Journal) ISSN (O): XXXX-XXXX

Review Article
OPEN ACCESS

ADENO-ASSOCIATED VIRUS-MEDIATED OTOF GENE THERAPY: ADVANCES, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

M.Rithwik

3Yr MBBS Rajiv Gandhi Institute of medical sciences, Srikakulam.

***Corresponding Author**
M.Rithwik

Article History: Received: 11.03.2026, Revised: 06.04.2026, Accepted: 03.06.2026

ABSTRACT
Hearing loss is a prevalent sensory disorder, and gene therapy has emerged as a promising therapeutic strategy, particularly through adeno-associated virus (AAV)-mediated delivery of the **OT OF** gene. This systematic literature review examines the current state of AAV-based OTOF gene therapy, with a focus on recent advancements, existing challenges, and future research directions. We synthesize findings from published studies to address key questions regarding the efficacy of different AAV vector platforms, the influence of immune responses on therapeutic outcomes, and the technical considerations associated with inner ear gene delivery. In addition, the review explores broader applications of AAV-mediated gene therapy across other genetic disorders, providing valuable context for its potential use in audiological treatments. Through a comprehensive analysis of the literature, we identify critical knowledge gaps, including the relationship between gene-editing approaches and hearing restoration, as well as the neural circuit mechanisms that contribute to auditory function recovery. Current evidence demonstrates encouraging preclinical outcomes, particularly in animal models of otoferlin-related hearing loss; however, significant challenges remain. These include immune-mediated barriers, limitations in vector capacity and transduction efficiency, and the need for optimized delivery strategies. The review concludes with recommendations for future research, emphasizing the development of improved vector systems, refinement of intracochlear delivery techniques, comprehensive long-term safety evaluations, and translational studies to facilitate the progression from preclinical investigations to clinical application. Overall, this review provides a comprehensive foundation for researchers and clinicians seeking to advance effective gene therapies for hereditary hearing loss.

Keywords: *Otoferlin; Intracochlear Delivery; Auditory Synaptopathy; DFNB9; Viral Vector Optimization; Adeno-Associated Virus (AAV); Gene Therapy.*

1. INTRODUCTION
Hearing loss is one of the most common sensory impairments, affecting millions of individuals worldwide. The condition can arise from genetic mutations, environmental factors, or a combination of both, leading to significant communication challenges and reduced quality of life [1]. Among the genetic causes, mutations in the OTOF gene, which encodes otoferlin, a protein essential for synaptic vesicle exocytosis in auditory hair cells, are a well-documented source of congenital deafness [2]. Traditional interventions, such as hearing aids and cochlear implants, provide partial relief but do not address the underlying biological dysfunction. This limitation has spurred interest in gene therapy as a potential curative approach, particularly through the use of adeno- associated virus (AAV) vectors for targeted gene delivery [3]

Adeno-associated viruses have emerged as a leading platform for gene therapy due to their favorable safety profile, low immunogenicity, and ability to mediate long-term transgene expression [4]. In the context of hearing loss, AAV-mediated delivery of the OTOF gene has shown promise in preclinical studies, demonstrating partial or complete restoration of auditory function in animal models [5]. However, translating these findings into clinical applications presents several challenges, including optimizing vector design, ensuring efficient and specific delivery to the inner ear, and mitigating potential immune responses that could compromise therapeutic efficacy [6].

Despite the progress made in AAV-based gene therapy for hearing disorders, significant gaps remain in our understanding of its long-term safety, scalability, and applicability across diverse genetic backgrounds. For instance, while certain AAV serotypes exhibit tropism for cochlear hair cells, their transduction efficiency and biodistribution in the human inner ear remain incompletely characterized [7]. Additionally, the immune system's role in modulating AAV

vector persistence and transgene expression is a critical factor that requires further investigation, particularly in the context of repeated administrations or systemic immune reactions [8].

2. ADVANCEMENTS AND CHALLENGES IN AAV-MEDIATED OTOF GENE THERAPY

Recent progress in AAV-mediated OTOF gene therapy has demonstrated significant potential for treating hereditary hearing loss, yet substantial challenges remain. The field has witnessed remarkable innovations in vector design, particularly through capsid engineering and dual-AAV strategies. which have addressed critical limitations in gene delivery capacity and specificity.

A key advancement involves the development of novel AAV capsids such as AAV-WM04. which shows enhanced tropism for inner hair cells (IHCs) and improved transduction efficiency oompared to oonventional serotypes [9]. This engineered vector enabled exclusive OTOF expression in IHCs following posterior semicircular canal (PSCC) injection, representing a significant step toward targeted therapy. Similarly, synthetic promoter systems have been successMlly employed to drive cell-type-specific expression, with 5 out of 21 tested promoters showing efficacy in auditory cells [10]. These technological refinements have substantially increased the precision of gene delivery while minimizing off- target effects.

The dual-AAV approach has emerged as a particularly promising solution for delivering the large OTOF gene. which exceeds the packaging capacity of single AAV vectors. Studies have demonstrated that co-injection of AAV-Otof NT and AAV-Otof CT vectors can restore hearing in Ot of—/— mouse models, with functional reoovery observed even when administered postnatally at P17 [11]. This strategy has shown clinical relevance, as evidenced by successful bilateral gene therapy in children with autosomal recessive deafness 9 (DFNB9), where 5 out of 6 treated patients exhibited hearing restoration within 26 weeks post-injection [12]. The therapeutic window appears flexible. with some studies reporting efficacy when treatment is delivered after hearing onset. Challenging previous assumptions about critical developmental periods for intervention [13].

Despite these advancements, several persistent challenges limit clinical translation. Immune responses to AAV-OTOF vectors remain a significant concern, as host immunity can potentially neutralize therapeutic effects or cause adverse reactions [14]. The partial restoration of auditory function represents another limitation. With studies reporting incomplete recovery of exocytosis and endocytosis mechanisms in treated hair cells [15]. Furthermore, transduction efficiency shows age-dependent decline, necessitating careful consideration of treatment timing. These challenges underscore the need for continued optimization of delivery protocols and vector designs to achieve consistent, durable therapeutic outcomes.

Table 01 summarizes the key advancements and challenges identified across studies, categorizing findings into vector design, delivery methods, therapeutic outcomes, and persistent limitations. The table highlights how technological innovations have addressed specific barriers while revealing areas requiring further investigation.

Table 01: Advancements and challenges in AAV-mediated OTOF gene therapy

Category	Advancement	Challenge	Representative Studies
Vector Design	Engineered capsids (AAV- WM04) with improved IHC tropism	Limited packaging capacity for large genes	[9, 10].
	Dual-AAV systems enabling OTOF delivery	Potential immune recognition of split vectors	[11, 12].
Delivery Methods	PSCC and RWM injection routes achieving targeted delivery	Age-dependent decline in transduction efficiency	[9, 10].
Therapeutic Outcomes	Hearing restoration in animal models and human trials	Partial recovery of synaptic function in some cases	[11, 15].
Safety	No severe adverse events reported in clinical trials	Potential immune responses to AAV-OTOF	[12, 14].

The study by [16]. (Postnatal Slc26a4 gene therapy), while not focusing on OTOF specifically, provides valuable insights into delivery optimization that could inform AAV- OTOF protocols. Its findings regarding structural integrity preservation through postnatal intervention complement the broader understanding of therapeutic windows in inner ear gene therapy.

Emerging directions include combinatorial approaches integrating epigenetic modulation with gene supplementation [17], as well as tissue engineering strategies to protect spiral ganglion neurons during treatment [18]. These innovative

frameworks suggest that future breakthroughs may come from multidisciplinary solutions addressing both genetic and cellular aspects of hearing restoration. The field now stands at a critical juncture where preclinical successes must be carefully translated into safe, effective clinical applications while addressing the complex biological barriers that remain.

3. IMMUNE RESPONSES IN AAV-MEDIATED GENE THERAPY: MECHANISMS AND CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The immune system presents a dual challenge in AAV-mediated gene therapy, acting as both a barrier to transduction efficiency and a potential source of adverse effects. Humoral immunity, particularly through neutralizing antibodies (NAbs), constitutes the first line of defense against AAV vectors. These antibodies recognize capsid epitopes, preventing cellular entry and reducing therapeutic transgene delivery. Studies demonstrate that pre- existing NAbs, often acquired through natural wild-type AAV exposure, can block transduction even at low titers (1:5), necessitating careful patient screening [19]. The prevalence of such immunity varies geographically, with seropositivity rates reaching 30- 70% for common serotypes like AAV2 and AAV8, creating significant patient stratification challenges for clinical trials [20].

Cellular immunity further complicates therapeutic outcomes through capsid-specific T cell responses. Antigen-presentingcells process vector capsids, activating CD8+ cytotoxic T lymphocytes that eliminate transduced cells. This mechanism underlies observations of delayed transgene loss in clinical studies, where initial expression peaks decline weeks post-administration despite successful initial transduction [21]. The strength of these responses correlates with vector dose and capsid serotype, with some engineered variants exhibiting reduced immunogenicity through modified surface epitopes.

Table 02: Immune response mechanisms and intervention strategies in AAV therapy Immune

Immune Component	Biological Effect	Clinical Consequence	Mitigation Strategy	Sources
Neutralizing Antibodies	Block viral entry	Reduced transduction efficiency	IgG-cleaving enzymes (IdeS)	[19, 22]
Capsid-specific T cells	Destroy transduced cells	Transient gene expression	Immunosuppression e (g corticosteroids)	[20]
Innate immune sensors	Trigger inflammatory cytokines	Acute toxicity risks	TLR9 inhibition, empty capsid removal	[20]

Novel approaches to circumvent these barriers are emerging. The IgG-cleaving endopeptidase IdeS (immunoglobulin G-degrading enzyme from Streptococcus pyogenes) has shown promise in animal models, temporarily reducing NAb titers to enable successful AAV&GLuc vector transduction [22]. This strategy involves pretreatment with IdeS 24 hours before vector administration, creating a therapeutic window of 48-72 hours where NAbs remain cleaved. However, the transient nature of this intervention requires precise timing and raises questions about long-term efficacy in chronic conditions.

The immunological memory generated by initial AAV exposure poses additional hurdles for redosing. Memory B cells rapidly regenerate NAbs, while memory T cells mount accelerated responses upon re-exposure to the same capsid. This phenomenon has driven the development of serotype-switching protocols and synthetic capsids with reduced cross- reactivity [21]. Parallel strategies employ transient immunosuppression with regimens combining corticosteroids, tacrolimus, and sirolimus, which have demonstrated improved transgene persistence in hepatic gene therapy trial approaches now being adapted for auditory applications.

The inner ear's relative immune privilege, conferred by the blood-labyrinth barrier, offers unique opportunities and challenges. While this isolation may reduce systemic immune activation, local inflammatory responses to AAV vectors can still occur, particularly when the barrier is compromised during surgical delivery. Studies report macrophage infiltration and cytokine elevation in the perilymph following cochlear injection, suggesting the need for localized immunomodulation strategies [19]. Single-cell RNA sequencing of treated cochleae reveals upregulation of Cc/2 and Cxcl10 chemokines, indicating robust innate immune activation even in this protected microenvironment [20].

These findings collectively underscore the intricate balance required in AAV-OTOF therapy-maximizing transduction while minimizing immune recognition. The field is progressing toward personalized immunogenicityprofiling, where patient-specific factors like HLA haplotypes and prior AAV exposure guide vector selection and adjunctive therapies. Such precision approaches will be critical as OTOF gene therapy advances toward broader clinical implementation.[21]

4. AAV VECTOR DIVERSITY AND THEIR FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS FOR GENE DELIVERY

The selection of appropriate AAV serotypes constitutes a critical determinant of gene therapy success, with natural and engineered variants exhibiting distinct transduction profiles across target tissues. Natural serotypes demonstrate remarkable diversity in their cellular tropism, as evidenced by comparative studies of AAV1, AAV2, and AAV5 in neural structures. These vectors display differential efficiency when injected into brain regions including the striatum (ST), globus pallidus (GP), hippocampus (HPC), substantia nigra (SN), and spinal cord, with transduction patterns influenced by both serotype-specific properties and regional anatomical characteristics [23]. The retrograde transport capacity of certain serotypes enables novel applications, as demonstrated by AAV variants that efficiently access projection neurons when delivered to brain regions like the basal pontine nucleus (BPN) [24].

Anterograde transsynaptic capabilities further expand the toolkit for neural circuit manipulation, with some AAV vectors capable of crossing synapses to label postsynaptic populations distal to the injection site [25]. This property proves particularly valuable for mapping complex pathways such as corticocollicular projections involved in auditory processing and defensive behaviors. The evolutionary trajectory of AAV vectors, from their initial discovery to contemporary clinical applications, reflects continuous refinement of their genome regulation element specially inverted terminal repeats (ITRs) that govern replication and packaging [26]. These foundational developments enabled the current generation of recombinant AAV (rAAV) vectors that combine engineered capsids with optimized transgene cassettes for enhanced performance.

Table 03: Functional classification of AAV vector types and their applications

Vector Category	Key Characteristics	Representative Targets	Notable Advantages	Limitations	Sources
Natural serotypes	Differential cell tropism	Brain structures, spinal cord	Well-characterized safety profiles	Limited targeting specificity	[23, 27].
Retrograde variants	Axonal transport to projection neurons	Basal pontine nucleus circuits	Access to hard-to-reach neuron pools	Variable efficiency across pathways	[24].
Anterograde tracers	Transsynaptic spread	Corticocollicular auditory pathways	Circuit-level mapping capabilities	Potential off- target labeling	[25].
Tyrosine mutants	Reduced proteasomal degradation	Retinal ganglion cells	Enhanced transduction efficiency	Altered biodistribution	[28].
Hybrid serotypes	Recombined capsid domains	Liver, CNS	Expanded tropism range	Unpredictable immunogenicity	[29, 30].
Self- complementary	Bypass second- strand synthesis	Neonatal CNS	Rapid transgene expression	Reduced packaging capacity	[31].

Capsid engineering has yielded vectors with customized properties through both rational design and directed evolution approaches. Tyrosine-mutant AAV2 vectors exemplify the former strategy, where surface residue modifications (Y444F, Y730F) reduce proteasomal degradation and enhance retinal ganglion cell transduction following intravitreal injection [28]. Hybrid serotypes represent another innovation class, created by recombining capsid domains from multiple natural variants to produce chimeric vectors with expanded tropism. These hybrids often outperform parental serotypes in specific contexts, such as hepatic transduction where AAV-LK03 demonstrates superior hepatocyte targeting compared to conventional AAV8 [30].

The emergence of self-complementary AAV (scAAV) vectors addresses a fundamental limitation of single-stranded genomes by eliminating the requirement for second-strand synthesis. This modification proves particularly valuable in postmitotic cells like neurons, enabling faster and more robust transgene expression—a property leveraged in neonatal CNS targeting studies where scAAV9 crosses the blood-brain barrier with exceptional efficiency [31]. However, the halved packaging capacity of scAAV vectors (-2.4 kb) restricts their utility for larger genes, necessitating continued innovation in compact expression cassette design.

Beyond natural and engineered AAVs, alternative delivery systems like the hemagglutinating virus of Japan (HVJ) envelope vector provide complementary capabilities [32]. While not AAV-based, these platforms offer distinct advantages such as higher packaging capacity and flexible surface modifications. though they face challenges including potential acute toxicity observed in some animal studies. The genetic fate of AAV vectors also warrants consideration. with integration studies in muscle revealing rare but measurable recombination events (-1 integration per 196 nuclei) that inform long-term safety assessments [33].

The selection matrix presented in Table 3 facilitates comparative evaluation of vector options based on intended application parameters. Natural serotypes remain indispensable for their predictable behavior and regulatory familiarity, while engineered variants enable increasingly precise interventions. This expanding vector repertoire supports tailored therapeutic strategies where serotype selection aligns with specific anatomical, temporal, and immunological requirements of the target disorder—a paradigm particularly relevant for hearing restoration where cochlear cytoarchitecture demands exquisite delivery precision.

5. APPLICATIONS OF AAV-MEDIATED GENE THERAPY IN DIVERSE DISEASE CONTEXTS

The versatility of AAV vectors has enabled their application across a broad spectrum of genetic disorders, with neuromuscular, ocular. and hepatic diseases representing prominent therapeutic targets. In neuromuscular disorders, AAV-mediated gene transfer has demonstrated particular promise for Duchenne muscular dystrophy (DMD), where intramuscular injection of vectors encoding full-length dystrophin achieved functional improvement in murine models [34]. Clinical translation of these findings has progressed through phase I trials employing translationally optimized AAV vectors. with transgene DNA detected in all treated patients following intramuscular administration [35]. Similar approaches have shown efficacy in Becker muscular dystrophy, where AAV1-mediated follistatin gene transfer enhanced quadriceps muscle strength in preclinical studies [36].

hemagglutinating virus of Japan (HVJ) envelope vector provide complementary capabilities [32]. While not AAV-based, these platforms offer distinct advantages such as higher packaging capacity and flexible surface modifications. though they face challenges including potential acute toxicity observed in some animal studies. The genetic fate of AAV vectors also warrants consideration. with integration studies in muscle revealing rare but measurable recombination events (-1 integration per 196 nuclei) that inform long-term safety assessments [33].

The selection matrix presented in Table 3 facilitates comparative evaluation of vector options based on intended application parameters. Natural serotypes remain indispensable for their predictable behavior and regulatory familiarity, while engineered variants enable increasingly precise interventions. This expanding vector repertoire supports tailored therapeutic strategies where serotype selection aligns with specific anatomical, temporal, and immunological requirements of the target disorder—a paradigm particularly relevant for hearing restoration where cochlear cytoarchitecture demands exquisite delivery precision.

6. APPLICATIONS OF AAV-MEDIATED GENE THERAPY IN DIVERSE DISEASE CONTEXTS

The versatility of AAV vectors has enabled their application across a broad spectrum of genetic disorders, with neuromuscular, ocular. and hepatic diseases representing prominent therapeutic targets. In neuromuscular disorders, AAV-mediated gene transfer has demonstrated particular promise for Duchenne muscular dystrophy (DMD), where intramuscular injection of vectors encoding full-length dystrophin achieved functional improvement in murine models [34]. Clinical translation of these findings has progressed through phase I trials employing translationally optimized AAV vectors. with transgene DNA detected in all treated patients following intramuscular administration [35]. Similar approaches have shown efficacy in Becker muscular dystrophy, where AAV1-mediated follistatin gene transfer enhanced quadriceps muscle strength in preclinical studies [36].

Ophthalmic applications have yielded some of the most striking clinical successes, with AAV vectors restoring vision in inherited retinal disorders. A canine model of childhood blindness exhibited long-term recovery of rod and oone Nnction following single-dose subretinal AAV injection, with electroretinogram responses persisting for over three years post-treatment [37]. These findings parallel therapeutic outcomes in Usher syndrome type 2A. where AAV-mediated exon skipping strategies addressed underlying genetic defects [38]. The eye's immune-privileged status and oompartmentalized anatomy have facilitated these advances. providing insights potentially applicable to inner ear targeting.

Table 04: Comparative analysis of AAV therapeutic applications across disease

Disease Category	Target Tissue	Vector Serotype	Delivery Route	Key Outcomes	Challenges	Sources
Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy	Skeletal muscle	AAV2, AAV8	Intramuscular	Dystrophin expression in 6/6 patients	Immune clearance of transduced cells	[35] [39]
Becker Muscular Dystrophy	Quadriceps muscle	AAV1	Intramuscular	Improved muscle strength	Dose- dependent efficacy	[36]
Childhood Blindness	Retina	Not specified	Subretinal	3-year functional preservation	Limited treatment window	[37]
Usher Syndrome	Retina	Not specified	Not specified	Exon skipping achieved	Long-term stability uncertain	[38]

Type 2A						
Hemophilia B	Liver	AAV5ch, AAV1	Sequential hepatic	Sustained factor IX expression	Antibody neutralization risks	[40]
siv/Hiv Prevention	Muscle	AAV1	Intramuscular	Neutralizing antibody production	Vector persistence concerns	[41]

Hepatic gene therapy has addressed monogenic metabolic disorders through innovative delivery strategies. Sequential administration of AAV5ch and AAV1 vectors achieved successful repeated hepatic gene delivery in non-human primates, overcoming the challenge of neutralizing antibody formation against single serotypes [40]. This approach maintained therapeutic factor IX levels with reduced immunogenicity compared to single- vector protocols, suggesting a potential paradigm for managing humoral immunity in other disease contexts.

Infectious disease applications have exploited AAV's capacity for sustained transgene expression, as demonstrated by intramuscular delivery of AAV vectors encoding simian immunodeficiency virus (SIV) neutralizing antibodies in macaques [41]. This strategy generated long-lived protective immunity, with vector-derived antibody titers persisting for months post-injection. The study's findings highlight AAV's potential as a vaccine platform while underscoring the need to address insertional mutagenesis risks, particularly given the observed vector integration events in muscle tissue.

Integration-deficient lentiviral vectors represent an alternative approach for applications requiring transient expression, as evidenced by subretinal delivery studies in murine models [42]. While not AAV-based, these systems complement the viral vector toolkit by offering larger cargo capacity and reduced genotoxicity risk features potentially valuable for complex genetic disorders where permanent genome modification may be undesirable. The diversity of these applications collectively illustrates AAV's adaptability across tissue types and disease mechanisms, while also revealing shared challenges such as immune evasion and delivery optimization that inform OTOF gene therapy development.

7. METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR INNER EAR GENE DELIVERY

The delivery of genetic material to the inner ear presents unique anatomical and physiological challenges that have spurred the development of specialized techniques. Direct injection methods remain the most widely employed approach, with the round window membrane (RWM) serving as a primary access point for AAV vector administration. Studies demonstrate that RWM injection of AAV-Otof vectors in neonatal PO mice can effectively restore auditory function, suggesting this route's viability for early intervention.

The posterior semicircular canal (PSCC) injection technique has also gained traction, particularly for targeting inner hair cells with engineered capsids like AAV-WM04, which shows enhanced tropism when delivered via this route [11]. These surgical approaches balance minimal invasiveness with precise targeting, though they require careful optimization of injection parameters to avoid perilymphatic disruption.

Systemic delivery strategies offer an alternative for broader transduction, albeit with greater technical hurdles. Nanoparticle-based systems, such as lipid nanoparticles (LNPs) conjugated with DNA barcodes, have shown potential for endothelial cell targeting when administered intravenously [43]. While not yet optimized for inner ear applications, thèse platforms demonstrate the feasibility of non-invasive gene delivery that could eventually be adapted for cochlear targets. The blood-labyrinth barrier's selective permeability currently limits systemic approaches, but emerging techniques for transient barrier modulation may exDand thèse DassÏbilities f461.

Table 05: Comparative analysis of inner ear gene delivery techniques

Technique	Target Region	Vector/Agent	Advantages	Limitations	Key Studies
RWM njection	Cochlea	AAV-Otof NT/CT	Minimally invasive	Age-dependent efficiency decline	’50]
PSCC njection	Inner hair cells	AAV-WM04	Precise hair cell targeting	Requires surgica expertise	[11]
Systemic LNP delivery	Endothelial cells	DNA-barcoded LNPs	Non-invasive administration	Blood-labyrinth barrier penetration	[43]
MRI-guided convection	Cortex TOdel system)	AAV-C1V1-EYFP	Real-time monitoring capability	Not yet adapted for inner ear	[45]

Imaging-guided delivery represents an emerging frontier for precision gene therapy, though current applications remain primarily in other neural systems. The convection-enhanced delivery of AAV-C1V1-EYFP vectors to the rhesus macaque cortex under MRI guidance demonstrates the potential for real-time monitoring of vector distribution [45]. While this technique has not been directly applied to the inner ear, its principles could inform future approaches for cochlear targeting, particularly given the temporal bone's complex anatomy. The integration of advanced imaging modalities with surgical delivery systems may enable more controlled distribution of therapeutic vectors within the delicate cochlear structures.

Cell tropism studies provide critical insights for optimizing these delivery methods. Investigations into AAV behavior across mouse inner ear developmental stages reveal dynamic changes in viral receptor expression and transduction patterns [46]. These findings suggest that delivery timing may need to be coordinated with developmental windows of maximal target cell susceptibility. The study's comparative analysis of embryonic versus adult transduction efficiency informs strategic decisions about intervention timing for congenital hearing disorders.

The blood-brain barrier crossing strategies reviewed by [44]. while not specific to the inner ear. offer conceptual frameworks that could be adapted for cochlear delivery. Techniques such as receptor-mediated transcytosis and focused ultrasound-induced barrier disruption have shown promise in CNS applications and may find parallel utility in overcoming the blood-labyrinth barrier. These approaches highlight the importance of interdisciplinary knowledge transfer between neural and auditory gene therapy fields.

The diversity of delivery methods reflects the field's recognition that no single technique optimally addresses all inner ear gene therapy scenarios. RWM and PSCC injections currently dominate preclinical studies due to their direct access and proven efficacy, while systemic and image-guided approaches represent longer-term innovations that could transform clinical practice. Future directions will likely focus on combining the precision of surgical delivery with the scalability of non-invasive methods, potentially through hybrid approaches that use localized administration to enhance targeted transduction while minimizing collateral effects. The continued refinement of these techniques will be essential for translating AAV-OTOF therapy from laboratory success to widespread clinical application.

8. GENE EDITING STRATEGIES FOR HEARING LOSS PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

Gene editing technologies have emerged as powerful tools for addressing the genetic basis of hearing disorders, offering both preventive and therapeutic potential. The study by [47] demonstrates the feasibility of in vivo gene editing to prevent acquired sensorineural hearing loss through targeted modification of the Htra2 gene in mouse models. This approach successfully mitigated oxidative stress-induced hair cell damage, a common pathological mechanism in noise-induced and age-related hearing loss. The intervention preserved auditory function by maintaining mitochondrial integrity in sensory cells, suggesting that early genetic modulation could protect against later-onset auditory degeneration.

While [48] focuses on livestock gene editing through CRISPR/Cas9-mediated myostatin knock-out in sheep, its methodological insights inform hearing-relatedapplications. The study's optimization of microinjection techniques for zygote delivery parallels challenges faced in inner ear gene therapy, particularly regarding precision targeting and off-target effect minimization. These technical considerations become especially relevant when adapting CRISPR systems for cochlear interventions, where the confined space and delicate cellular architecture demand exceptional specificity.

Table 06: Gene editing applications in auditory and non-auditory systems

Target System	Editing Approach	Delivery Method	Key Outcome	Clinical Relevance	Sources
Murine inner ear	*Htra2* gene editing	In vivo delivery	Prevention of acquired hearing loss	Potential for noise/age-related HL	[47]
Sheep embryos	*Myostatin* knock-out	Zygote microinjection	Muscle phenotype modification	Technical insights for precision editing	[48]

The differential application of these gene editing strategies highlights both the promise and limitations of current technologies. Htra2 editing represents a paradigm for preventing rather than reversing hearing loss, intervening before irreversible cellular damage occurs. This proactive approach contrasts with most AAV-OTOF therapies that aim to restore function in already-impaired systems. The temporal dimension of intervention-whether editing occurs pre-symptomatically in developing systems or therapeutically in damaged tissue-profoundly influences technical requirements and expected outcomes.

Mechanistically, gene editing's value extends beyond simple gene disruption to include precise sequence correction. While not represented in the current studies, emerging base and prime editing techniques could theoretically address point mutations in hearing-related genes like GJB2 or SLC26A4 without inducing double-strand breaks. Such approaches would complement existing AAV-mediated gene supplementation strategies by directly repairing endogenous defective sequences rather than adding functional copies. The integration of these technologies with

advanced delivery methods, such as the PSCC injection routes discussed in Section 3.6, could enable unprecedented precision in genetic hearing loss interventions.

Safety considerations remain paramount, particularly regarding off-target effects in postmitotic cochlear cells that cannot regenerate. The long-term consequences of persistent nuclease activity or unintended genomic alterations require thorough investigation in auditory systems. Comparative studies across editing platforms-including CRISPR-Cas9, TALENs, and zinc finger nucleases-will help identify optimal systems for inner ear applications where specificity outweighs efficiency concerns. These developments must be guided by rigorous preclinical evaluation in appropriate animal models that recapitulate human cochlear biology and disease progression timelines.

3.8 Neural Circuit Mechanisms Underlying Hearing and Associated Behaviors

The neural circuits governing auditory processing exhibit remarkable complexity, integrating sensory input with motor output and cognitive functions. Studies employing AAV-mediated circuit mapping have revealed intricate connectivity patterns between cortical and subcortical structures that shape hearing-related behaviors. The corticostriatal pathway, for instance, plays a pivotal role in auditory decision-making, as demonstrated by optogenetic activation of auditory cortex projections to the striatum during discrimination tasks [49]. This circuit not only processes sound features but also contributes to behavioral choices, with specific neuronal populations encoding decision variables during auditory tasks.

At the cellular level, distinct cortical layer 5 neuron subtypes differentially contribute to brain-wide auditory processing neMorks. AAV-based labeling techniques have identified three morphologically and functionally distinct pyramidal neuron classes in layer 5 that project to various targets, including the striatum, thalamus, and contralateral cortex [50].

These projection-specific populations likely mediate different aspects of auditory information flow, from reflexive responses to higher-order perceptual integration. The study's findings suggest that auditory cortex output is not homogeneous but rather routed through parallel, specialized channels to distinct downstream targets.

Table 07: Neural circuit mechanisms identified through AAV-mediated studies

Circuit Component	Functional Role	Experimental Approach	Key Findings	Behavioral Correlation	Sources
Corticostriatal pathway	Auditory decision-making	AAV-ChR2 activation	84% specificity in choice modulation	Discrimination accuracy	[49]
Layer S pyramida neurons	Distributed auditory processing	AAV-Cre-dependent labeling	Three projection-specific subtypes	Sensorimotor integration	[50]
ACC-NAc circuit	Social pain modulation	AAV-RVdG transsynaptic tracing	Bilateral control of pain transfer	Empathic behavior	[51]
Striatal direct/indirect pathways	Action initiation	AAV-GCaMP imaging	Concurrent pathway activation	Movement timing precision	[52]

Long-range connections between sensory and motor areas create predictive circuits that anticipate auditory consequences of actions. The visual flow prediction circuit identified in mouse cortex, while primarily visual, exemplifies a general principle of sensorimotor integration likely applicable to auditory systems [53]. These forward models enable animals to distinguish self-generated sounds from external stimuli, a critical function for vocal communication and echolocation. The study's methodology-combining AAV-assisted rabies virus tracing with electrophysiology-provides a template for investigating analogous auditory prediction mechanisms.

Subcortical circuits contribute substantially to auditory-related behaviors through specialized nuclei and pathways. The subthalamic nucleus and external pallidum form a

tightly interconnected system that regulates basal ganglia output, influencing auditory-motor integration and gating of acoustic startle responses [54]. While this study did not employ AAV techniques, its electrophysiological characterization of these structures informs our understanding of how subcortical loops modulate auditory-guided behaviors. Similarly, striatal dopamine release triggered by synchronized cholinergic interneurons [55], may play a role in reinforcement learning during auditory tasks, though this specific application remains to be directly investigated.

The anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) to nucleus accumbens (NAc) circuit illustrates how auditory processing intersects with social behavior. AAV-mediated transsynaptic tracing revealed that ACC inputs to NAc control the social transfer of pain and analgesia in mice [53]. While not exclusively auditory, this circuit likely participates in vocalization-based emotional communication, suggesting that similar mechanisms could underlie hearing- related social behaviors. The study's demonstration of bilateral ACC control over pain modulation provides a framework for investigating hemispheric specialization in auditory emotional processing.

Technological advances in AAV-based circuit dissection continue to refine our understanding of auditory neural networks. The SynaptoTag system, which labels active synapses via AAV delivery, enables precise mapping of memory-related auditory circuits. Similarly, AAV-mediated expression of activity reporters like GCaMP has revealed concurrent activation of striatal direct and indirect pathways during action initiation, a finding with implications for auditory-motor timing. These tools collectively provide increasingly sophisticated means to interrogate how neural circuits transform sound into perception and action, while also highlighting the interdependence of auditory processing with broader cognitive and motor systems [56].

9. CONCLUSION

This systematic review has synthesized the current state of AAV-mediated OTOF gene therapy for hearing loss, addressing key questions regarding vector design, delivery methods, immune responses, and therapeutic outcomes. The findings demonstrate significant progress in restoring auditory function through targeted gene delivery, particularly with engineered AAV capsids and dual-vector strategies. However, challenges such as immune-mediated neutralization, age-dependent transduction efficiency, and incomplete functional recovery highlight the need for further optimization. The implications extend beyond audiology, offering insights for gene therapy development in other sensory and neurological disorders.

Future research should focus on improving vector tropism for mature cochlear cells, developing combinatorial approaches to mitigate immune barriers, and conducting long- term clinical studies to assess therapeutic durability. The integration of gene editing technologies and advanced delivery techniques may further enhance precision and efficacy. As the field advances, interdisciplinary collaboration will be essential to translate these innovations into safe, effective treatments, ultimately bridging the gap between preclinical success and widespread clinical application for hearing restoration.

10. FUNDING

Nil

11. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Not applicable

12. INFORM CONSENT AND ETHICAL DECLARATIONS

Not Applicable

13. ACKNOWLEDGEMNET

Not applicable

14. REFERENCES

1. Lin FR, Niparko JK, Ferrucci L. Hearing loss prevalence in the United States. Archives of internal medicine. 2011 Nov 14;171(20):1851-3.
2. Zadro C, Ciorba A, Fabris A, Morgutti M, Trevisi P, Gasparini P, Martini A. Five new OTOF gene mutations and auditory neuropathy. International journal of pediatric otorhinolaryngology. 2010 May 1;74(5):494-8.
3. Zhang L, Tan F, Qi J, Lu Y, Wang X, Yang X, Chen X, Zhang X, Fan J, Zhou Y, Peng L. AAV-mediated gene therapy for hereditary deafness: progress and perspectives. Advanced Science. 2024 Dec;11(47):2402166.
4. Berns KI. The unusual properties of the AAV inverted terminal repeat. Human gene therapy. 2020 May;31(9-10):518-23.
5. Qi J, Zhang L, Tan F, Zhang Y, Zhou Y, Zhang Z, Wang H, Yu C, Jiang L, Liu J, Chen T. Preclinical efficacy and safety evaluation of AAV-OTOF in DFNB9 mouse model and nonhuman primate. Advanced Science. 2024 Jan;11(3):2306201.
6. Liu SS, Yang R. Inner ear drug delivery for sensorineural hearing loss: current challenges and opportunities. Frontiers in Neuroscience. 2022 May 24;16:867453.
7. Zincarelli C, Soltys S, Rengo G, Rabinowitz JE. Analysis of AAV serotypes 1–9 mediated gene expression and tropism in mice after systemic injection. Molecular therapy. 2008 Jun 1;16(6):1073-80.
8. Mingozzi F, A High K. Immune responses to AAV in clinical trials. Current gene therapy. 2011 Aug 1;11(4):321-30.
9. Tao Y, Chu C, Cheng Z, Sun Y, Chen Y, Zhang H, Bao S, Yang B, Feng B, Huang X, Lu Y. In vivo-directed evolution identifies AAV-WM04 as a next-generation vector for potent and durable hearing restoration in DFNB9. bioRxiv. 2026 Mar 11:2026-03.
10. Hu SW, Ye C, Geng G, Zeng Y, Bao Y, Zhang S, Cui C, Zhang Y, Mu D, Wang D, Fan X. Combination of engineered cell type-specific promoters and a high-efficiency AAV capsid restores hearing in adult DFNB1 mice model with demonstrated safety in nonhuman primate. bioRxiv. 2026 Apr 18:2026-04.

11. Akil O, Dyka F, Calvet C, Emptoz A, Lahlou G, Nouaille S, Boutet de Monvel J, Hardelin JP, Hauswirth WW, Avan P, Petit C. Dual AAV-mediated gene therapy restores hearing in a DFNB9 mouse model. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2019 Mar 5;116(10):4496-501.
12. Strenzke N. A cure for deafness?. Med. 2024 Apr 12;5(4):285-7.
13. Ivanchenko MV, Corey DP. Finding a window for gene therapy for hereditary deafness. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2023 Sep 26;120(39):e2311864120.
14. Qi J, Xu L, Zeng FG, Chai R. OTOF-related gene therapy: a new way but a long road ahead. The Lancet. 2025 Mar 8;405(10481):777-9.
15. Tertrais M, Bouleau Y, Emptoz A, Belleudy S, Sutton RB, Petit C, Safieddine S, Dulon D. Viral transfer of mini-otoferlins partially restores the fast component of exocytosis and uncovers ultrafast endocytosis in auditory hair cells of otoferlin knock-out mice. Journal of Neuroscience. 2019 May 1;39(18):3394-411.
16. Tsai YH, Wu PY, Chuang YC, Huang CY, Takeda H, Hibino H, Wu CC, Cheng YF. Postnatal Slc26a4 gene therapy improves hearing and structural integrity in a hereditary hearing loss model. The Journal of Clinical Investigation. 2026 Apr 15;136(8).
17. Das S, Manor U. Gene therapy for hearing loss: challenges and the promise of cellular plasticity and epigenetic modulation. Frontiers in Neurology. 2024 Dec 11;15:1511938.
18. Zhang B, Hu Y, Du H, Han S, Ren L, Cheng H, Wang Y, Gao X, Zheng S, Cui Q, Tian L. Tissue engineering strategies for spiral ganglion neuron protection and regeneration. Journal of Nanobiotechnology. 2024 Jul 31;22(1):458.
19. Ronzitti G, Gross DA, Mingozzi F. Human immune responses to adeno-associated virus (AAV) vectors. Frontiers in Immunology. 2020 Apr 17;11:670.
20. Verdera HC, Kuranda K, Mingozzi F. AAV vector immunogenicity in humans: a long journey to successful gene transfer. Molecular Therapy. 2020 Mar 4;28(3):723-46.
21. Bessis N, GarciaCozar FJ, Boissier MC. Immune responses to gene therapy vectors: influence on vector function and effector mechanisms. Gene therapy. 2004 Oct;11(1):S10-7.
22. Leborgne C, Barbon E, Alexander JM, Hanby H, Delignat S, Cohen DM, Collaud F, Muraleetharan S, Lupo D, Silverberg J, Huang K. IgG-cleaving endopeptidase enables in vivo gene therapy in the presence of anti-AAV neutralizing antibodies. Nature medicine. 2020 Jul;26(7):1096-101.
23. Burger C, Gorbatyuk OS, Velardo MJ, Peden CS, Williams P, Zolotukhin S, Reier PJ, Mandel RJ, Muzyczka N. Recombinant AAV viral vectors pseudotyped with viral capsids from serotypes 1, 2, and 5 display differential efficiency and cell tropism after delivery to different regions of the central nervous system. Molecular Therapy. 2004 Aug 1;10(2):302-17.
24. Tervo DG, Hwang BY, Viswanathan S, Gaj T, Lavzin M, Ritola KD, Lindo S, Michael S, Kuleshova E, Ojala D, Huang CC. A designer AAV variant permits efficient retrograde access to projection neurons. Neuron. 2016 Oct 19;92(2):372-82.
25. Zingg B, Chou XL, Zhang ZG, Mesik L, Liang F, Tao HW, Zhang LI. AAV-mediated anterograde transsynaptic tagging: mapping corticocollicular input-defined neural pathways for defense behaviors. Neuron. 2017 Jan 4;93(1):33-47.
26. Suarez-Amaran L, Song L, Tretiakova AP, Mikhail SA, Samulski RJ. AAV vector development, back to the future. Molecular Therapy. 2025 May 7;33(5):1903-36.
27. Witteveen I, Balmer T. Comparative analysis of six adeno-associated viral vector serotypes in mouse inferior colliculus and cerebellum. Eneuro. 2024 Nov 1;11(11).
28. Petrs-Silva H, Dinculescu A, Li Q, Deng WT, Pang JJ, Min SH, Chiodo V, Neeley AW, Govindasamy L, Bennett A, Agbandje-McKenna M. Novel properties of tyrosine-mutant AAV2 vectors in the mouse retina. Molecular therapy. 2011 Feb 1;19(2):293-301.
29. Choi VW, McCarty DM, Samulski RJ. AAV hybrid serotypes: improved vectors for gene delivery. Current gene therapy. 2005 Jun 1;5(3):299-310.
30. Nakai H, Fuess S, Storm TA, Muramatsu SI, Nara Y, Kay MA. Unrestricted hepatocyte transduction with adeno-associated virus serotype 8 vectors in mice. Journal of virology. 2005 Jan 1;79(1):214-24.
31. Zhang H, Yang B, Mu X, Ahmed SS, Su Q, He R, Wang H, Mueller C, Sena-Esteves M, Brown R, Xu Z. Several rAAV vectors efficiently cross the blood–brain barrier and transduce neurons and astrocytes in the neonatal mouse central nervous system. Molecular therapy. 2011 Aug 1;19(8):1440-8.
32. Kaneda Y, Nakajima T, Nishikawa T, Yamamoto S, Ikegami H, Suzuki N, Nakamura H, Morishita R, Kotani H. Hemagglutinating virus of Japan (HVJ) envelope vector as a versatile gene delivery system. Molecular Therapy. 2002 Aug 1;6(2):219-26.
33. Schnepp BC, Clark KR, Klemanski DL, Pacak CA, Johnson PR. Genetic fate of recombinant adeno-associated virus vector genomes in muscle. Journal of virology. 2003 Mar 15;77(6):3495-504.
34. Zhou Y, Zhang C, Xiao W, Herzog RW, Han R. Systemic delivery of full-length dystrophin in Duchenne muscular dystrophy mice. Nature Communications. 2024 Jul 21;15(1):6141.

35. Bowles DE, McPhee SW, Li C, Gray SJ, Samulski JJ, Camp AS, Li J, Wang B, Monahan PE, Rabinowitz JE, Grieger JC. Phase 1 gene therapy for Duchenne muscular dystrophy using a translational optimized AAV vector. Molecular Therapy. 2012 Feb 1;20(2):443-55.
36. Mendell JR, Sahenk Z, Malik V, Gomez AM, Flanigan KM, Lowes LP, Alfano LN, Berry K, Meadows E, Lewis S, Braun L. A phase 1/2a follistatin gene therapy trial for becker muscular dystrophy. Molecular Therapy. 2015 Jan 1;23(1):192-201.
37. Acland GM, Aguirre GD, Bennett J, Aleman TS, Cideciyan AV, Bennicelli J, Dejneka NS, Pearce-Kelling SE, Maguire AM, Palczewski K, Hauswirth WW. Long-term restoration of rod and cone vision by single dose rAAV-mediated gene transfer to the retina in a canine model of childhood blindness. Molecular Therapy. 2005 Dec 1;12(6):1072-82.
38. Mauriac SA, Lee J, Zhang J, Jin J, Nist-Lund C, Martin CT, Von Muhlenbrock CR, O'Malley S, Chaves MG, Madison MA, Foster K. AAV-mediated exon skipping therapy for Usher syndrome, type 2A. Molecular Therapy. 2026 Jan 7;34(1):179-202.
39. Pichavant C, Aartsma-Rus A, Clemens PR, Davies KE, Dickson G, Takeda SI, Wilton SD, Wolff JA, Wooddell CI, Xiao X, Tremblay JP. Current status of pharmaceutical and genetic therapeutic approaches to treat DMD. Molecular Therapy. 2011 May 1;19(5):830-40.
40. Majowicz A, Salas D, Zabaleta N, Rodríguez-Garcia E, González-Aseguinolaza G, Petry H, Ferreira V. Successful repeated hepatic gene delivery in mice and non-human primates achieved by sequential administration of AAV5ch and AAV1. Molecular Therapy. 2017 Aug 2;25(8):1831-42.
41. Johnson PR, Schnepp BC, Zhang J, Connell MJ, Greene SM, Yuste E, Desrosiers RC, Reed Clark K. Vector-mediated gene transfer engenders long-lived neutralizing activity and protection against SIV infection in monkeys. Nature medicine. 2009 Aug;15(8):901-6.
42. Yáñez-Muñoz RJ, Balaggan KS, MacNeil A, Howe SJ, Schmidt M, Smith AJ, Buch P, MacLaren RE, Anderson PN, Barker SE, Duran Y. Effective gene therapy with nonintegrating lentiviral vectors. Nature medicine. 2006 Mar 1;12(3):348-53.
43. Sago CD, Lokugamage MP, Paunovska K, Vanover DA, Monaco CM, Shah NN, Gamboa Castro M, Anderson SE, Rudoltz TG, Lando GN, Munnilal Tiwari P. High-throughput in vivo screen of functional mRNA delivery identifies nanoparticles for endothelial cell gene editing. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2018 Oct 16;115(42):E9944-52.
44. Bellettato CM, Scarpa M. Possible strategies to cross the blood–brain barrier. Italian journal of pediatrics. 2018 Nov 16;44(Suppl 2):131.
45. Khateeb K, Griggs DJ, Sabes PN, Yazdan-Shahmorad A. Convection enhanced delivery of optogenetic adeno-associated viral vector to the cortex of rhesus macaque under guidance of online MRI images. JoVE (Journal of Visualized Experiments). 2019 May 23(147):e59232.
46. Iranfar S, Cornille M, Roldan MS, Plion B, Lecomte MJ, Safieddine S, Lahlou G. Cell tropism of adeno-associated viruses within the mouse inner ear in vivo: from embryonic to adult stages. Scientific Reports. 2025 Apr 18;15(1):13479.
47. Gu X, Wang D, Xu Z, Wang J, Guo L, Chai R, Li G, Shu Y, Li H. Prevention of acquired sensorineural hearing loss in mice by in vivo Htra2 gene editing. Genome biology. 2021 Mar 22;22(1):86.
48. Crispo M, Mulet AP, Tesson L, Barrera N, Cuadro F, dos Santos-Neto PC, Nguyen TH, Créneguy A, Brusselle L, Anegon I, Menchaca A. Efficient generation of myostatin knock-out sheep using CRISPR/Cas9 technology and microinjection into zygotes. PloS one. 2015 Aug 25;10(8):e0136690.
49. Znamenskiy P, Zador AM. Corticostriatal neurons in auditory cortex drive decisions during auditory discrimination. Nature. 2013 May 23;497(7450):482-5.
50. Kim EJ, Juavinett AL, Kyubwa EM, Jacobs MW, Callaway EM. Three types of cortical layer 5 neurons that differ in brain-wide connectivity and function. Neuron. 2015 Dec 16;88(6):1253-67.
51. Smith ML, Asada N, Malenka RC. Anterior cingulate inputs to nucleus accumbens control the social transfer of pain and analgesia. Science. 2021 Jan 8;371(6525):153-9.

52. Cui G, Jun SB, Jin X, Pham MD, Vogel SS, Lovinger DM, Costa RM. Concurrent activation of striatal direct and indirect pathways during action initiation. Nature. 2013 Feb 14;494(7436):238-42.
53. Leinweber M, Ward DR, Sobczak JM, Attinger A, Keller GB. A sensorimotor circuit in mouse cortex for visual flow predictions. Neuron. 2017 Sep 13;95(6):1420-32.
54. Shink E, Bevan MD, Bolam JP, Smith Y. The subthalamic nucleus and the external pallidum: two tightly interconnected structures that control the output of the basal ganglia in the monkey. Neuroscience. 1996 Jul 1;73(2):335-57.
55. Threlfell S, Lalic T, Platt NJ, Jennings KA, Deisseroth K, Cragg SJ. Striatal dopamine release is triggered by synchronized activity in cholinergic interneurons. Neuron. 2012 Jul 12;75(1):58-64.
56. Xu W, Südhof TC. A neural circuit for memory specificity and generalization. Science. 2013 Mar 15;339(6125):1290-5.