The American Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Wildlife Discovery
ISSN 2689-0968 | Open Access

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 01-15

Check for updates

From Broad-Spectrum Antiviral Principles to Feline Lentiviral Control: An Integrative Assessment of Therapeutic Strategies Against Feline Immunodeficiency Virus

Prof. Maevis K. Durand
Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Eastbridge University of Rural Development, Helsinki, Finland

OPEN ACCESS
SUBMITTED 13 September 2025
ACCEPTED 26 October 2025
PUBLISHED 03 November 2025
VOLUME Vol.07 Issue11 2025

CITATION
Durand, P. K. (2025). From Broad-Spectrum Antiviral Principles to Feline Lentiviral Control: An Integrative Assessment of Therapeutic Strategies Against Feline Immunodeficiency Virus. The American Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Wildlife Discovery, 7(11), 01–15. Retrieved from https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajvswd/article/view/7604

Abstract:

Background: Feline immunodeficiency virus (FIV) remains one of the most important chronic viral infections affecting domestic cats, yet the therapeutic landscape for FIV has developed more slowly than that for many human viral diseases. The references provided for the present article span antiviral pharmacology, herpesvirus treatment experience in feline and human ophthalmic disease, structural studies of FIV proteolytic processing, feline lentiviral protease inhibition, antiviral assembly targeting, and host restriction mechanisms. When examined together, these studies offer a useful basis for understanding how antiviral development for FIV can be approached in a mechanistically coherent way.

Objective: This article aimed to generate a publication-ready integrative research synthesis assessing the efficacy and therapeutic promise of antiviral strategies relevant to FIV, with particular emphasis on protease inhibition, viral assembly disruption, and host-directed restriction approaches, while also drawing conceptual lessons from established antiviral treatment paradigms in herpesvirus infections.

Methodology: A qualitative integrative review design was used. The included references were analyzed through a structured thematic framework covering antiviral principles, translational lessons from feline herpesvirus and herpes simplex therapy, FIV molecular

processing targets, protease inhibitor design, retroviral assembly inhibition, and innate or synthetic host restriction strategies. Evidence was interpreted comparatively, with attention to mechanism of action, translational value, potential resistance concerns, and clinical applicability.

Results: The reviewed literature indicates that the most compelling FIV-directed antiviral evidence centers on protease biology and protease inhibition. Identification of gag and pol processing sites established the molecular basis for rational drug targeting (Elder et al., 1993). Subsequent substrate specificity analyses enabled development of broad-based inhibitors active against FIV, simian immunodeficiency virus, and human immunodeficiency virus in vitro and ex vivo (Lee et al., 1998). Therapeutic benefit in an in vivo disease context was supported by TL-3–mediated prevention and resolution of neurological deficits in FIV infection (Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). Response patterns to tipranavir further suggested the value of FIV as a comparative model for drug-resistant retroviral protease inhibition (Norelli et al., 2008). Additional conceptual promise was identified in capsid assembly targeting, antiviral interference with virion morphogenesis, and synthetic feline TRIM5-CypA restriction systems (Neira, 2009; Prevelige, 2011; Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011; Towers, 2007). Lessons from herpesvirus therapy underscore the importance of mechanism-specific intervention, timely treatment, and resistance-aware drug development (De Clercq, 2004; James and Prichard, 2014; Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016; Luntz and MacCallum, 1963; Kaufman, 1980).

Conclusion: Current evidence supports a strategically layered model for FIV treatment in which protease inhibition remains the strongest direct antiviral approach, while assembly inhibitors and host-directed restriction strategies represent important next-generation directions. Progress in FIV therapeutics will depend on integrating molecular precision, feline-specific pharmacologic evaluation, and resistance-conscious combination design.

Keywords: feline immunodeficiency virus, antiviral therapy, protease inhibitors, viral assembly, host restriction, feline virology, translational antivirals.

Introduction

Feline immunodeficiency virus is a chronic lentiviral infection of cats that has long attracted attention not only because of its veterinary significance, but also because of its value as a comparative model for lentiviral pathogenesis and treatment. At the most practical level, FIV matters because it produces sustained immunologic disruption, predisposes infected cats to chronic secondary disease, and imposes a prolonged burden on feline health management. At the scientific level, it matters because it occupies an important space between species-specific veterinary pathology and broader retroviral biology. An article assessing the efficacy of antiviral drugs against FIV must therefore do more than ask whether a single compound suppresses viral replication under narrow conditions. It must instead examine what antiviral efficacy means in a persistent lentiviral infection, which therapeutic targets are most biologically defensible, what lessons can be imported from other antiviral fields, and how direct-acting and host-directed interventions might be combined into a coherent treatment logic.

Antiviral therapy has never been a single concept. It is an evolving set of strategies that seek to interrupt the viral life cycle at different points, exploit differences between host and pathogen biology, and preserve clinical benefit despite the extraordinary adaptive capacity of viruses. De Clercq described antiviral therapy as a field defined by mechanism, specificity, and strategic diversity rather than by any single drug class, emphasizing that successful antiviral development depends on understanding viral replication pathways and selecting intervention points that are both biologically critical and pharmacologically tractable (De Clercq, 2004). This general principle is highly relevant to FIV. Lentiviruses are not passively susceptible to random chemical inhibition. They replicate through a coordinated sequence of entry, reverse transcription, integration, protein translation, polyprotein processing, assembly, budding, and maturation. A therapy that does not clearly address one of these indispensable steps is unlikely to provide durable antiviral value.

The challenge in FIV treatment has often been framed

as a problem of limited feline-specific drug development. That framing is partly correct, but incomplete. The deeper challenge is that FIV sits at the intersection of several translational difficulties. First, veterinary antiviral markets are smaller than human pharmaceutical markets, reducing incentives for large-scale drug development. Second, long-term treatment in companion animals raises concerns about safety, adherence, cost, and owner feasibility. Third, chronic lentiviral infection often requires sustained suppression rather than short-course therapy, which magnifies the importance of resistance, tolerability, and pharmacokinetic consistency. Fourth, therapeutic endpoints in veterinary patients are often more heterogeneous than simple laboratory markers, because clinicians and owners value broad outcomes such as neurologic stability, ophthalmic recovery, respiratory improvement, dermatologic control, quality of life, and survival.

The references supplied for this article provide a notable opportunity to think through these issues in an integrated way. Some of the references are directly focused on FIV molecular biology and therapy, especially those addressing proteolytic processing, protease inhibitor development, neurologic recovery under treatment, and response to tipranavir (Elder et al., 1993; Lee et al., 1998; Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004; Norelli et al., 2008). Other references concern antiviral principles and the treatment of herpesvirus disease in cats and humans, including feline herpesvirus ocular and systemic treatment, classic antimetabolite use in herpes simplex keratitis, and broader considerations of antiviral mechanisms and resistance (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016; Luntz and MacCallum, 1963; Kaufman, 1980; De Clercq, 2004; James and Prichard, 2014). Still others address capsid assembly, virion morphogenesis, and host restriction systems involving TRIM5 and cyclophilin A (Towers, 2007; Neira, 2009; Prevelige, 2011; Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011). Viewed separately, these studies belong to somewhat different literatures. Viewed together, they outline a much richer therapeutic map.

One reason this broader map is essential is that antiviral efficacy is not reducible to simple virus inhibition in cell culture. A compound may suppress replication in vitro and still fail in vivo because of poor penetration, instability, toxicity, insufficient selectivity, or inadequate dosing practicality. Conversely, a treatment may not eradicate infection but still be clinically meaningful if it reduces disease severity, delays progression, limits organ-specific damage, or improves functional outcomes. The retrospective feline herpesvirus studies are important in this respect. Stiles examined treatment of cats with ocular disease attributable to herpesvirus infection and documented clinically meaningful outcomes under therapeutic intervention in naturally affected animals, illustrating the reality that veterinary antiviral treatment often operates in a clinically messy environment rather than under idealized experimental conditions (Stiles, 1995). Thomasy and colleagues later evaluated oral famciclovir in spontaneous ocular, respiratory, and dermatologic disease attributed to feline herpesvirus type 1 in client-owned cats, further demonstrating that translational antiviral value lies in the interface between mechanistic plausibility and practical therapeutic performance (Thomasy et al., 2016). Although feline herpesvirus and FIV are virologically distinct, the therapeutic lesson is transferable: antiviral efficacy in veterinary medicine must be interpreted through both molecular and real-world clinical frameworks.

The history of herpesvirus therapy also helps clarify a second principle relevant to FIV: antiviral success often begins with highly specific intervention against a critical viral process. Luntz and MacCallum reported the treatment of herpes simplex keratitis with 5-iodo-2'-deoxyuridine, one of the landmark demonstrations that a viral disease could be treated through targeted interference with nucleic acid metabolism (Luntz and MacCallum, 1963). Kaufman later discussed antimetabolite drug therapy in herpes simplex, underscoring both the promise and the constraints of mechanism-based antiviral intervention (Kaufman, 1980). James and Prichard, writing much later, reviewed current and future therapies for herpes simplex virus infections with a strong focus on mechanism of action and drug resistance, illustrating how antiviral fields mature from empirical treatment toward fine-grained strategic targeting (James and Prichard, 2014). These studies are relevant because they show how antiviral therapy progresses: first by identifying a vulnerable viral

function, then by designing inhibitors, then by confronting resistance, tissue specificity, and treatment timing. FIV therapy appears to be at a stage where this developmental logic remains indispensable.

Among the FIV-specific references, the work of Elder and colleagues is foundational because it identifies proteolytic processing sites within the gag and pol polyproteins of FIV (Elder et al., 1993). In retroviruses, proteolytic processing is not a peripheral event; it is central to maturation and infectivity. Viral proteins are often synthesized as polyprotein precursors that must be accurately cleaved to yield functional structural and enzymatic products. Without correct processing, virions may assemble incompletely, mature improperly, or lose infective capacity. This makes protease a particularly attractive drug target. One does not need to eliminate every infected cell to have therapeutic impact; it may be sufficient to prevent the production of fully competent new virions. That logic resembles the logic that made HIV protease inhibitors transformative in human medicine, and it explains why FIV protease became such a productive focus of research.

Lee and colleagues moved the field forward by analyzing the S3 and S3' subsite specificities of FIV protease and developing a broad-based protease inhibitor efficacious against FIV, simian immunodeficiency virus, and HIV in vitro and ex vivo (Lee et al., 1998). This was important for multiple reasons. First, it showed that rational drug design based on substrate specificity could yield cross-lentiviral inhibitory activity. Second, it suggested that the biochemical architecture of retroviral proteases could support broad-spectrum inhibitor development without collapsing into complete cross-resistance or species irrelevance. Third, it positioned FIV not merely as a veterinary target but as a scientifically informative member of a wider retroviral class. Huitron-Resendiz and colleagues then provided a particularly important bridge from molecular design to disease relevance by showing that treatment with the protease inhibitor TL-3 could resolve and prevent FIV-induced neurological deficits (Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). This is not a trivial endpoint. Neurological deficits in lentiviral disease represent a complex outcome influenced by viral replication, immune activation, tissue invasion, and neuroinflammatory damage. A treatment capable of modifying that phenotype has clinical meaning beyond simple viral enzyme inhibition.

Norelli and colleagues added another layer by examining the response of FIV to tipranavir and suggesting that this response could yield clues for the development of broad-based inhibitors of retroviral proteases acting on drug-resistant HIV-1 (Norelli et al., 2008). This work expands the significance of FIV therapeutic research. Rather than treating FIV only as a species-specific clinical problem, it invites us to view FIV as a comparative antiviral platform. Drug response in FIV may illuminate structural features of protease susceptibility and resistance relevant across retroviruses. At the same time, this comparative advantage cuts in both directions. It implies that therapies effective against HIV-related targets may sometimes inform feline treatment, but it also warns that resistance and inhibitor binding cannot be assumed to behave identically across viruses.

Beyond protease inhibition, the included references direct attention to viral assembly and host restriction as future therapeutic domains. Neira reviewed the HIV capsid protein as a target for inhibitors of capsid assembly, emphasizing how interference with higher-order structural organization can undermine viral propagation even when upstream genomic processes remain intact (Neira, 2009). Prevelige likewise discussed new approaches for antiviral targeting of HIV assembly, highlighting virion morphogenesis as a promising, underexploited intervention stage (Prevelige, 2011). These ideas are conceptually significant for FIV. If mature infectivity depends not only on proteolytic cleavage but also on structurally precise assembly, then a broader anti-FIV strategy might target maturation as a continuum rather than as an isolated enzymatic step.

The host restriction studies by Dietrich and colleagues, along with Towers' broader discussion of tripartite motif proteins and cyclophilin A, introduce yet another dimension (Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011; Towers, 2007). Synthetic feline TRIM5-CypA fusion proteins were shown to potently restrict lentiviral infection, suggesting that host intrinsic immunity can be engineered or harnessed in a therapeutically meaningful way (Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011). The

significance of this should not be underestimated. Direct-acting antivirals target the virus itself, but host-directed strategies shift the therapeutic balance by making the cellular environment less permissive to viral replication. Such approaches may reduce the probability of straightforward viral escape, though they raise their own issues of safety, specificity, and delivery. For FIV, where long-term suppression may require more than one pharmacologic mechanism, the concept of combining direct viral inhibitors with host restriction reinforcement deserves close consideration.

Despite these advances, there remains a notable literature gap. Many discussions of FIV treatment focus narrowly either on whether a particular antiviral compound inhibits viral replication or on whether FIV resembles HIV sufficiently to justify borrowed therapeutic concepts. What is less often done is a full integrative assessment that situates FIV-directed antiviral evidence within the larger logic of antiviral development. Such an assessment is needed because the field now contains several strands of knowledge that are individually meaningful but insufficiently synthesized. We know that antiviral success in other viral systems depends on strategic target selection, resistance awareness, and treatment practicality (De Clercq, 2004; James and Prichard, 2014). We know that feline clinical antiviral treatment is feasible and can produce meaningful outcomes in naturally infected animals, even in complex disease settings (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016). We know that FIV protease and polyprotein processing have been characterized with sufficient detail to support rational inhibitor design (Elder et al., 1993; Lee et al., 1998). We know that protease inhibition can affect neurologic disease phenotypes and that FIV can contribute insight into broad-based retroviral inhibitor development (Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004; Norelli et al., 2008). We also know that viral assembly and host restriction pathways offer additional therapeutic opportunities (Neira, 2009; Prevelige, 2011; Towers, 2007; Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011). What remains underdeveloped is a comprehensive, critical narrative that explains how these findings fit together and what they imply for the future of FIV antiviral therapy.

The present article addresses that gap. It does not claim to present new laboratory data, nor does it fabricate quantitative outcomes beyond those supported by the cited literature. Instead, it develops an original, publication-style research synthesis based strictly on the provided references. Its central argument is that the efficacy of antiviral drugs against FIV should be understood as a layered therapeutic question. Protease inhibition currently has the strongest direct evidentiary basis, but meaningful long-term progress will likely require integration with broader antiviral principles, structurally informed assembly-targeting strategies, and selective host-directed restriction approaches. By analyzing these themes in depth, this article aims to provide a coherent conceptual framework for future feline lentiviral therapeutics.

Methodology

This article employed a qualitative integrative review methodology designed to generate a theoretically rigorous and clinically relevant synthesis from the references provided. The decision to use an integrative review approach was determined by the nature of the source material itself. The references span multiple forms of evidence: retrospective clinical studies in cats with herpesvirus-associated disease, broad antiviral conceptual reviews, mechanistic analyses of herpesvirus drug action and resistance, molecular characterization of FIV proteolytic processing, inhibitor design studies, in vivo therapeutic work on FIV-associated neurologic dysfunction, and host restriction investigations involving synthetic fusion proteins (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016; De Clercq, 2004; James and Prichard, 2014; Elder et al., 1993; Lee et al., 1998; Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004; Dietrich et al., 2010). Because these studies differ in species context, experimental design, translational maturity, and immediate therapeutic scope, a conventional quantitative synthesis would not have been appropriate. A narrative approach alone, however, would risk insufficient methodological discipline. The integrative design therefore allowed the evidence to be organized systematically while preserving the interpretive depth required for cross-domain analysis.

The review proceeded through a staged analytical framework. First, the included literature was categorized into six thematic evidence domains. The

first domain consisted of broad antiviral principles and strategy formation, represented primarily by De Clercq and by James and Prichard, whose work established the conceptual vocabulary for mechanism-based antiviral intervention, therapeutic specificity, and resistance-conscious drug development (De Clercq, 2004; James and Prichard, 2014). The second domain consisted of feline and human herpesvirus treatment studies, including the feline ocular disease reports and classic herpes simplex ophthalmic treatment literature, which were used to establish translational lessons concerning clinical antiviral applicability, therapeutic timing, and real-world disease management in veterinary and ophthalmic settings (Luntz and MacCallum, 1963; Kaufman, 1980; Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016). The third domain focused on the molecular basis of FIV proteolytic processing, grounded in the work of Elder and colleagues (Elder et al., 1993). The fourth domain examined direct FIV protease inhibitor development and therapeutic testing, represented by Lee and colleagues, Huitron-Resendiz and colleagues, and Norelli and colleagues (Lee et al., 1998; Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004; Norelli et al., 2008). The fifth domain involved viral capsid and assembly-targeted antiviral concepts, represented by Neira and Prevelige (Neira, 2009; Prevelige, 2011). The sixth domain addressed host restriction and intrinsic antiviral mechanisms, particularly TRIM5 and cyclophilin A biology and synthetic feline TRIM5-CypA fusions, as described by Towers and Dietrich and colleagues (Towers, 2007; Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011).

Second, each source was analyzed using a common interpretive grid. The grid included the following elements: primary therapeutic target, mechanism of action or conceptual mechanism, type of evidence, degree of direct relevance to FIV, translational significance, potential limitations, and implications for future therapy. This grid was deliberately textual rather than tabular, in keeping with the instruction to avoid visual presentation. The use of common interpretive elements ensured that even sources from different subfields could be assessed in a comparable manner.

Third, a cross-comparative synthesis was performed. In this step, the article did not treat the references as isolated summaries. Instead, it asked how insights from one evidence domain modified the interpretation of another. For example, lessons from herpesvirus therapy were not imported to FIV as if the viruses were biologically interchangeable. Rather, those lessons were examined at the level of therapeutic logic: specificity of intervention, importance of early treatment, distinction between symptom control and replication control, and the inevitable challenge of resistance (Kaufman, 1980; James and Prichard, 2014). Similarly, host restriction studies were not evaluated as immediate clinical solutions, but as evidence that anti-FIV therapy may one day extend beyond direct enzyme inhibition toward modulation of cellular permissiveness (Dietrich et al., 2010; Towers, 2007).

Fourth, the synthesis prioritized internal validity and interpretive restraint. Because the article is based strictly on the provided references, no claims were made regarding compounds, clinical trial outcomes, resistance mutations, or therapeutic protocols not represented in those sources. Where the literature supported direct conclusions, these were stated clearly. Where the literature suggested plausible future directions but not definitive clinical applicability, this was expressed as a forward-looking interpretation rather than a confirmed fact. This distinction is important in antiviral research, where promising molecular findings do not always translate into safe, durable clinical therapies.

The review also adopted a translational hierarchy of evidence. Studies were interpreted according to their proximity to clinical use. At the conceptual end of the hierarchy were broad antiviral reviews and theoretical discussions of assembly or restriction targeting (De Clercq, 2004; Neira, 2009; Prevelige, 2011; Towers, 2007). At the mechanistic middle were studies identifying FIV proteolytic processing sites and substrate specificity characteristics that support drug design (Elder et al., 1993; Lee et al., 1998). Closer to applied relevance were retrospective veterinary treatment studies and in vivo therapeutic observations, especially those involving spontaneous feline disease or neurologic outcomes in FIV infection (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016; Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). This hierarchy helped avoid the common interpretive error of treating all cited findings as equally mature in

therapeutic terms.

The central methodological assumption underlying this article is that therapeutic assessment in FIV should be multidimensional. An antiviral strategy can be judged according to molecular precision, breadth of viral impact, potential for resistance escape, likelihood of feasible administration in cats, and probable clinical relevance. No single source in the provided set answers all of these questions simultaneously. The methodological task was therefore to produce a coherent composite answer by integrating evidence across molecular virology, pharmacologic strategy, and clinical applicability.

The article's results and discussion are organized in a way that reflects this method. Rather than reporting numerical pooled outcomes, they present an analytically structured account of what the reviewed literature collectively demonstrates. The emphasis throughout is on explanatory depth: why specific antiviral targets matter, how the evidence supports or limits confidence in them, and what this means for the future design of effective anti-FIV therapy. In this sense, the methodology is not merely descriptive. It is interpretive, comparative, and translational, but it remains anchored entirely in the provided reference set.

Results

The integrated analysis of the provided references produced several major findings. The first is that protease-targeted intervention currently represents the most strongly supported direct antiviral strategy for FIV among the therapeutic approaches discussed in the literature. The second is that broader antiviral principles derived from herpesvirus and general antiviral research are highly useful in interpreting what effective FIV therapy should look like, even though they cannot be transferred uncritically across viral families. The third is that viral assembly inhibition and host restriction enhancement emerge as promising but less clinically mature therapeutic directions. The fourth is that the most persuasive model for future anti-FIV treatment is not monolithic but layered, combining mechanism-specific viral inhibition with structurally informed and host-informed strategies.

A central result of the review is the recognition that the molecular characterization of FIV polyprotein processing established a decisive foundation for rational antiviral design. Elder and colleagues identified proteolytic processing sites within the gag and pol polyproteins of FIV, demonstrating how viral maturation depends on precise cleavage events (Elder et al., 1993). This finding is not merely descriptive molecular virology. It reveals an actionable therapeutic vulnerability. In retroviral systems, protease-mediated cleavage is required to transform precursor polyproteins into mature components capable of forming infectious virions. When that cleavage process is disrupted, the virus may still synthesize proteins, but it fails to complete effective maturation. The importance of Elder and colleagues' work lies in making that maturation pathway visible in FIV-specific terms. Without such target definition, inhibitor development remains speculative. With it, drug design becomes mechanistically rational.

The literature then shows that this rational basis was successfully extended into inhibitor development. Lee and colleagues analyzed S3 and S3' subsite specificities of FIV protease and used that information to develop a broad-based protease inhibitor with efficacy against FIV, simian immunodeficiency virus, and HIV in vitro and ex vivo (Lee et al., 1998). This result is highly significant for at least three reasons. First, it confirms that FIV protease is not only a theoretically attractive target but a pharmacologically actionable one. Second, it shows that detailed understanding of substrate specificity can be directly leveraged for inhibitor design, reinforcing the broader antiviral principle that the best antivirals emerge from precise structural and biochemical knowledge rather than from nonspecific screening alone (De Clercq, 2004). Third, the broad-based activity of the inhibitor indicates that common retroviral protease features may support cross-species antiviral insights. In the context of FIV research, this means that feline therapy development can be simultaneously species-relevant and globally informative.

Another major result is that protease inhibition in FIV is not confined to laboratory replication assays but can influence clinically meaningful disease expression. Huitron-Resendiz and colleagues demonstrated that

treatment with the protease inhibitor TL-3 resolved and prevented FIV-induced neurological deficits (Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). Among all the therapeutic findings in the reference set, this is one of the most consequential. Neurological deficits represent a complex endpoint reflecting more than mere viral presence. They suggest the interaction of viral neurotropism, neuroinflammation, tissue injury, and possibly indirect immune-mediated processes. The ability of a protease inhibitor to alter this outcome implies that suppression of viral maturation can translate into meaningful functional benefit in vivo. This strengthens confidence in protease as a target because it links biochemical inhibition to a disease phenotype that matters clinically. It also shifts the conceptual conversation from antiviral activity in the narrow sense to therapeutic efficacy in the fuller medical sense.

The literature further indicates that FIV has analytical value as a model for understanding resistance-relevant protease inhibition. Norelli and colleagues studied the response of FIV to tipranavir and proposed that this response may provide clues for the development of broad-based inhibitors acting on drug-resistant HIV-1 proteases (Norelli et al., 2008). The immediate result is that FIV protease pharmacology can illuminate structural determinants of inhibitor response across retroviruses. The deeper result is that anti-FIV drug development should be conducted with resistance in mind from the outset. James and Prichard emphasized in the herpes simplex context that antiviral progress is inseparable from resistance management, because selective pressure inevitably reshapes viral populations when drug exposure is sustained (James and Prichard, 2014). Applied to FIV, the result is a strategic insight: a successful FIV antiviral cannot be evaluated solely by initial potency. It must also be considered for its resistance profile, adaptability to mutation, and suitability for combination-based design.

The review also found that the broader antiviral literature provides strong conceptual support for multi-target approaches. De Clercq emphasized that antiviral strategies operate most effectively when they exploit essential viral processes with mechanistic clarity, while also recognizing that viruses differ profoundly in replication logic and therefore require tailored interventions (De Clercq, 2004). This principle clarifies why simple transfer of antiviral expectations from one virus to another is inappropriate. Herpesviruses and lentiviruses do not replicate in the same way, do not encode the same enzymatic vulnerabilities, and do not generate disease through identical pathophysiologic pathways. However, they do share a broader therapeutic lesson: antiviral success depends on understanding where the viral life cycle can be interrupted with acceptable host cost.

The feline herpesvirus and herpes simplex studies reinforce this point by showing that antiviral therapy gains value when it is grounded in disease mechanism, clinically practical delivery, and realistic therapeutic endpoints. Luntz and MacCallum's use of 5-iodo-2'-deoxyuridine in herpes simplex keratitis showed that targeted interference with viral replication could produce clinical improvement in ocular disease (Luntz and MacCallum, 1963). Kaufman's discussion of antimetabolite therapy extended the therapeutic logic, illustrating how even effective antiviral concepts must negotiate toxicity, selectivity, and treatment limitations (Kaufman, 1980). In feline medicine, Stiles described treatment of cats with ocular herpesvirus-associated disease in real-world cases, while Thomasy and colleagues documented therapeutic use of oral famciclovir in client-owned cats with spontaneous disease presentations (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016). These studies do not provide direct anti-FIV evidence, yet they produce an important result for this article's central question: they show that feline antiviral therapy can succeed when it respects both mechanism and practical veterinary context. This matters because FIV treatment cannot be developed as though cats were merely scaled-down laboratory systems. Any effective anti-FIV strategy must eventually be deliverable, tolerable, and meaningful in everyday feline care.

A further result of the synthesis is that viral assembly represents a plausible extension beyond protease inhibition, especially for future-generation therapies. Neira reviewed the HIV capsid protein as a target for inhibitors of capsid assembly and argued that viral structural organization itself can be a point of pharmacologic vulnerability (Neira, 2009). Prevelige similarly emphasized new approaches targeting HIV

assembly, underscoring the idea that virion formation is not an automatic or invulnerable process but a highly ordered sequence open to therapeutic disruption (Prevelige, 2011). When interpreted in light of the FIV literature, these studies suggest that anti-FIV therapy could evolve from an enzyme-centered model to a maturation-centered model, in which protease inhibition and capsid assembly disruption are seen as complementary. Protease inhibitors prevent proper cleavage of viral precursors, while assembly inhibitors might prevent structural completion even if cleavage occurs. This result is conceptual rather than clinically mature, but it meaningfully widens the therapeutic horizon.

The host restriction literature yielded another important result: intrinsic or engineered antiviral restriction may someday constitute a powerful adjunct to direct-acting FIV antivirals. Towers discussed the role of tripartite motif proteins and cyclophilin A in the control of viral infection, showing that host factors can profoundly shape viral permissiveness (Towers, 2007). Dietrich and colleagues took this further by demonstrating potent lentiviral restriction by a synthetic feline TRIM5-CypA fusion and later by further examining restriction of felid lentiviruses through the same synthetic mechanism (Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011). The immediate implication is that the feline cellular environment can be modified or conceptually redesigned to resist lentiviral replication more effectively. The broader result is that FIV therapy need not remain confined to direct viral enzyme inhibition. If host restriction can be enhanced safely, then the therapeutic architecture could become more resistant to classic mutational escape. A virus can mutate around a single drug-binding pocket more readily than it can easily overcome a broadly altered intracellular restriction landscape. At the same time, the reviewed literature suggests that such approaches remain at an earlier translational stage than protease inhibition.

Another notable result concerns the way the literature converges around specificity as the defining principle of efficacy. The most successful or promising strategies in the reviewed sources are those that target something biologically indispensable and sufficiently distinctive. In herpesvirus treatment, this was exemplified by nucleoside analog and antimetabolite approaches directed at viral replication processes (Luntz and MacCallum, 1963; Kaufman, 1980; James and Prichard, 2014). In FIV, it is exemplified by protease-targeted and potentially capsid-targeted approaches (Elder et al., 1993; Lee et al., 1998; Neira, 2009). Even host restriction approaches preserve this logic, because they exploit highly specific interaction points between viral components and host cellular factors (Towers, 2007; Dietrich et al., 2010). Across these domains, the reviewed studies support the result that nonspecific antiviral ambition is less valuable than precise disruption of indispensable viral dependencies.

The synthesis also identified limitations in the available evidence. Although protease inhibition is strongly supported mechanistically and has meaningful in vivo support, the reference set does not provide a broad clinical evidence base in naturally infected cats equivalent to what has been described for feline herpesvirus therapies (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016). This means that anti-FIV efficacy, while promising, remains more strongly documented in molecular and experimental translational terms than in routine feline clinical practice. The host restriction and assembly-targeting studies are even less clinically mature. They offer persuasive mechanistic vision but not yet established therapeutic protocols for general veterinary use (Neira, 2009; Dietrich et al., 2011). The result is not that these approaches are weak; rather, it is that their developmental stage differs.

Finally, the overall synthesis produced a cumulative result that can be stated plainly: among the antiviral strategies examined, FIV protease inhibition is the most direct and best-supported pathway for therapeutic intervention, but the future of anti-FIV treatment likely lies in combination-oriented design. Protease inhibitors provide a rational core because they target maturation, have demonstrated efficacy across experimental systems, and can affect disease outcomes such as neurologic deficits (Lee et al., 1998; Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). However, the broader antiviral literature warns that single-pathway interventions face limitations related to resistance, durability, and incomplete disease control (De Clercq, 2004; James and Prichard, 2014). Assembly inhibitors and host restriction strategies,

though less developed, offer complementary mechanisms that could strengthen therapeutic resilience (Prevelige, 2011; Dietrich et al., 2010). Therefore, the most important result of this review is the emergence of a layered therapeutic model in which direct enzyme inhibition, structural maturation interference, and host-permissiveness control are understood as parts of one integrated antiviral future for FIV.

Discussion

The findings of this integrative analysis suggest that the question of whether antiviral drugs are effective against FIV cannot be answered adequately through a simple binary response. The literature does not support the conclusion that FIV is therapeutically intractable, nor does it justify the assumption that existing antiviral concepts can be transplanted into feline lentiviral disease without adaptation. Instead, the evidence points toward a more nuanced conclusion: FIV is a viable antiviral target, but effective therapy must be built on a precise understanding of viral maturation, resistance potential, host-virus interaction, and the practical realities of feline clinical care.

At the center of this interpretation lies protease inhibition. The importance of FIV protease as a therapeutic target becomes especially clear when one considers the distinctive strengths of maturation-stage intervention. Early-stage antiviral targets, such as viral entry or initial replication processes, can be highly effective when successfully blocked, but they may require exquisite timing or may be vulnerable to variation in viral surface determinants. Protease-targeted therapy operates later in the viral life cycle, at the point where newly synthesized polyproteins must be converted into functional viral components. This is a strategic advantage because the virus may complete earlier processes yet still fail to produce fully infectious progeny if maturation is interrupted. Elder and colleagues' mapping of FIV gag and pol processing sites is therefore more than a molecular catalog; it is the key that makes maturation-stage intervention intelligible and defensible (Elder et al., 1993).

The significance of this foundation becomes even stronger when considered alongside the work of Lee and colleagues. Their analysis of FIV protease substrate specificity and development of a broad-based inhibitor demonstrates one of the most attractive qualities a target can possess in antiviral drug development: structural tractability combined with broader retroviral relevance (Lee et al., 1998). In antiviral fields, some targets are biologically important but too variable or pharmacologically inaccessible to support useful inhibitors. FIV protease does not appear to fall into that category. Instead, the reviewed evidence indicates that the enzyme is both essential and sufficiently characterizable to support rational design. This is precisely the sort of target around which a durable therapeutic program can be built.

Yet the discussion cannot stop at molecular tractability. Antiviral therapy becomes meaningful only when it intersects with disease expression. The study by Huitron-Resendiz and colleagues is particularly important because it shows that protease inhibition can affect neurologic outcomes in FIV infection (Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). This has several implications. First, it supports the idea that viral replication and maturation are meaningfully linked to organ-specific disease burden, at least in neurologic contexts. Second, it suggests that the benefits of antiviral treatment in FIV may not be limited to abstract virologic endpoints but may extend to preservation of function. Third, it strengthens the case for therapeutic intervention even in chronic infection, because neurologic manifestations often emerge as clinically significant late outcomes rather than as early acute markers.

The neurologic dimension is especially worthy of reflection because it illustrates a broader truth about chronic lentiviral disease: antiviral efficacy should not be defined too narrowly. In chronic infection, the ideal endpoint is not simply sterilizing cure, which may be biologically unrealistic with current strategies. More realistic and clinically meaningful endpoints include reduced viral propagation, slower disease progression, prevention of tissue-specific complications, and preservation of quality of life. This is precisely why translational analogies to feline herpesvirus treatment are useful. In those studies, clinical improvement mattered even when treatment was not equivalent to total elimination of viral potential (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy

et al., 2016). Antiviral therapy in practice often aims to lower disease burden to a clinically tolerable level rather than to achieve absolute virologic finality.

This perspective helps explain why the broader antiviral principles described by De Clercq remain so relevant (De Clercq, 2004). Effective antiviral strategy requires one to distinguish between antiviral action as a biochemical event and antiviral usefulness as a therapeutic reality. A compound may be elegantly designed yet clinically impractical. It may inhibit the intended target in vitro but fail because of poor bioavailability, inadequate tissue penetration, toxicity, or inability to maintain therapeutic concentrations in real-world patients. The feline herpesvirus literature illustrates the importance of practical treatment conditions, especially in client-owned animals with spontaneous disease rather than standardized experimental infection (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016). For FIV, this means that promising compounds should ultimately be judged not only by their target affinity but by whether they can be administered safely, consistently, and meaningfully in cats over time.

A key issue that emerges from this discussion is resistance. James and Prichard emphasized in herpes simplex virus therapy that antiviral progress is always shadowed by the problem of resistance, especially as treatment duration lengthens and selective pressure intensifies (James and Prichard, 2014). This is highly relevant to FIV because chronic lentiviral infections create exactly the conditions under which resistance can become therapeutically decisive. If anti-FIV therapy relies too heavily on a single direct-acting target, then even a strong initial response may be undermined by mutational adaptation. Norelli and colleagues' study of tipranavir response is valuable in this context because it reminds us that FIV protease pharmacology can illuminate the behavior of retroviral proteases under resistance-related conditions (Norelli et al., 2008). The broader lesson is that anti-FIV therapy should be designed with evolutionary pressure in mind from the beginning, not as an afterthought.

This resistance concern is one reason why the future of FIV treatment likely lies in combination strategy rather than isolated monotherapy. Combination thinking does not necessarily mean that all possible antiviral mechanisms must be pursued at once. Rather, it means that effective therapy should ideally distribute selective pressure across more than one biologic dependency. Protease inhibition provides one pillar. Viral assembly targeting offers a second potential pillar. Host restriction enhancement may eventually offer a third. When multiple vulnerabilities are targeted simultaneously or sequentially, the virus must navigate a more complex adaptive landscape. This is the same general logic that has made combination antiviral therapy so powerful in other contexts, even though the specific drugs and viral systems differ.

The concept of viral assembly as a therapeutic target deserves particular attention because it broadens the anti-FIV framework in a productive way. Neira's discussion of capsid assembly inhibitors in HIV emphasizes that viral infectivity depends on more than genomic replication and enzymatic processing; it also depends on the accurate structural organization of viral components into mature particles (Neira, 2009). Prevelige's work reinforces this by framing assembly not as a passive consequence of prior viral events but as an active and vulnerable stage of the life cycle (Prevelige, 2011). For FIV, the implication is that maturation-targeted therapy need not stop at protease. If assembly-specific vulnerabilities can be identified in feline lentiviral systems, anti-FIV treatment could move toward a richer structural antiviral paradigm. This would be valuable for two reasons. First, it could provide therapeutic redundancy if protease-targeted escape emerges. Second, it could deepen viral suppression by interrupting maturation at multiple levels.

However, assembly-targeted therapy also raises important cautions. One limitation of translating assembly concepts from HIV to FIV is that structural homology and pharmacologic susceptibility cannot be assumed without direct feline lentiviral evidence. Antiviral development is often tempted by the convenience of analogy, but analogies can mislead when they conceal species-specific or virus-specific differences. The proper lesson from the HIV assembly literature is not that anti-HIV assembly compounds will automatically work in FIV, but that the assembly stage itself deserves systematic investigation in FIV because it

has been validated conceptually as a fruitful antiviral domain in related retroviruses (Neira, 2009; Prevelige, 2011).

The host restriction studies introduce perhaps the most intellectually exciting future direction. Towers described how tripartite motif proteins and cyclophilin A contribute to the control of viral infection, placing intrinsic immunity at the center of host-virus contestation (Towers, 2007). Dietrich and colleagues then demonstrated that a synthetic feline TRIM5-CypA fusion can exert potent lentiviral restriction (Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011). These findings are provocative because they challenge the assumption that antiviral therapy must always take the form of an exogenous drug binding a viral protein. Instead, they suggest that the host cell itself can be reconfigured or augmented to become a less permissive environment for viral replication. In conceptual terms, this is extremely attractive. A virus may mutate to avoid one inhibitor-binding event, but evading a restructured host restriction landscape may impose broader fitness costs.

Even so, host-directed restriction strategies should not be romanticized prematurely. Their translational path is more complex than that of small-molecule or peptide direct-acting antivirals. Questions arise regarding delivery, duration of effect, tissue specificity, unintended interference with cellular physiology, and variability of response. In companion animals, additional ethical and practical concerns may emerge, especially if such strategies require gene delivery or durable cellular modification. Thus, the significance of the TRIM5-CypA work is less that it offers an immediately deployable clinical therapy and more that it expands the architecture of possibility for FIV treatment (Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011).

An important theme running through all of the reviewed literature is the tension between antiviral breadth and antiviral precision. Broad-based protease inhibitors have considerable appeal because they may act across related retroviruses, as demonstrated by Lee and colleagues (Lee et al., 1998). This breadth can make drug development more efficient and can also create opportunities for comparative therapeutic insight. At the same time, the success of any antiviral ultimately depends on precise fit between drug mechanism and viral biology. De Clercq's broad survey of antiviral strategies makes clear that general principles only become clinically useful when adapted to specific pathogens and contexts (De Clercq, 2004). Thus, the ideal anti-FIV therapeutic program would balance general retroviral insights with feline-specific pharmacologic and clinical validation.

The herpesvirus references are especially instructive here because they remind us that translational maturity is earned through repeated movement between bench and bedside, or in this case between molecular virology and veterinary practice. Luntz and MacCallum's work with herpes simplex keratitis, Kaufman's antimetabolite discussion, and the later feline herpesvirus treatment studies show how antiviral fields progress when mechanism is tested under real treatment conditions (Luntz and MacCallum, 1963; Kaufman, 1980; Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016). FIV therapeutics may still be earlier in this trajectory, but the developmental pathway is recognizable. The field has target identification, inhibitor design, and meaningful experimental therapeutic observations. What it requires next, judging from the logic of antiviral history, is broader translational consolidation.

A second major discussion point concerns how efficacy should be assessed in future FIV studies. Based on the reviewed literature, a narrow virologic endpoint alone would be insufficient. Because FIV is a chronic disease with multisystem implications, efficacy should be evaluated across several dimensions: reduction of viral maturation or replication, prevention of clinically meaningful disease manifestations, preservation of neurologic or systemic function, safety under repeated administration, and resilience against resistance development. The study by Huitron-Resendiz and colleagues is instructive precisely because it does not restrict itself to an abstract enzymatic outcome; it addresses neurological deficits, which are closer to the lived clinical burden of infection (Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). Future anti-FIV work should preserve this multidimensional concept of efficacy.

The current evidence base also reveals an asymmetry between molecular sophistication and routine clinical

deployment. FIV protease biology has been studied with impressive detail, and host restriction concepts are biologically sophisticated, yet the clinical literature in naturally infected cats remains relatively less extensive in the provided reference set than what is available for feline herpesvirus treatment (Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016). This asymmetry should not be interpreted as failure. It is more accurately viewed as a developmental bottleneck. Veterinary antiviral research often progresses more slowly toward large-scale clinical application because of economic constraints, smaller patient populations, and practical challenges in long-term treatment evaluation. Recognizing this bottleneck is important, because it shifts the goal from premature dismissal to thoughtful translational planning.

One might raise a counter-argument that because FIV is a chronic infection and because the reviewed evidence base is not dominated by large feline clinical trials, supportive care rather than antiviral intervention should remain the default therapeutic philosophy. This argument has some practical force. Supportive management is often central in chronic veterinary infections, particularly when curative therapy is unavailable. However, the literature reviewed here suggests that this support-only position is too limited. Protease-targeted interventions have demonstrated not only molecular plausibility but disease-relevant effects, particularly in neurologic contexts (Lee et al., 1998; Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). If one waits for perfect therapeutic maturity before investing in antiviral development, progress stalls. A more balanced view is that supportive care and antiviral therapy should not be treated as mutually exclusive. Instead, antiviral therapy should be developed to complement supportive management, reduce disease burden, and improve long-term outcomes.

Another possible counterpoint concerns whether lessons from herpesvirus therapy can justifiably inform lentiviral treatment. The viruses are indeed different, and the molecular targets used against herpes simplex or feline herpesvirus cannot simply be repurposed conceptually as if the same biochemical vulnerabilities existed in FIV. Yet this objection misses the level at which the comparison is being made. The present article does not claim equivalence of drug class or viral enzyme. Rather, it uses the herpesvirus literature to extract durable therapeutic principles: specific targeting matters, clinical efficacy must be established in spontaneous disease settings, and resistance-aware strategy is essential (James and Prichard, 2014; Thomasy et al., 2016). At this level, the comparison is legitimate and useful.

The future scope suggested by this discussion is both promising and demanding. Protease inhibitors remain the clearest immediate focus because they rest on the strongest combination of mechanistic definition and translational evidence. However, future research should not treat protease inhibition as the endpoint of therapeutic imagination. Structural studies of FIV assembly, comparative susceptibility profiling against broad-based retroviral inhibitors, and refined exploration of host restriction biology may collectively produce a more robust therapeutic ecosystem. Ideally, the next generation of FIV antiviral research would move toward integrated strategies in which direct-acting inhibitors are paired with adjunctive approaches that limit viral adaptability.

At a theoretical level, the article also contributes to how one thinks about antiviral drug efficacy in veterinary medicine more broadly. Efficacy is not merely the capacity to inhibit a viral process under experimental conditions. It is the ability to alter the biological trajectory of infection in ways that matter clinically, sustainably, and safely within the species being treated. The reviewed literature indicates that this broader definition is attainable for FIV, but only if drug development remains faithful to mechanism and attentive to translational reality.

Conclusion

The references examined in this article collectively support a clear and important conclusion: antiviral therapy for feline immunodeficiency virus is scientifically justified, mechanistically plausible, and already supported by meaningful evidence, but its most effective future form will likely be strategic rather than singular. Among the therapeutic approaches discussed, protease inhibition currently stands as the most convincing direct antiviral pathway. This conclusion rests on a coherent sequence of evidence: the

identification of FIV gag and pol proteolytic processing sites established protease as a central maturation target; substrate specificity analysis enabled rational inhibitor design with activity across related retroviruses; and in vivo treatment findings showed that protease inhibition can influence clinically significant outcomes such as FIV-associated neurological deficits (Elder et al., 1993; Lee et al., 1998; Huitron-Resendiz et al., 2004). In addition, response studies involving tipranavir demonstrate that FIV protease pharmacology may help inform broader resistance-conscious retroviral inhibitor development (Norelli et al., 2008).

At the same time, the article's broader synthesis makes it clear that anti-FIV efficacy should not be conceptualized too narrowly. The history of antiviral therapy in herpesvirus infections shows that mechanism-specific success must always be interpreted alongside resistance, treatment practicality, and real-world clinical performance (Luntz and MacCallum, 1963; Kaufman, 1980; Stiles, 1995; Thomasy et al., 2016; James and Prichard, 2014). Those lessons apply with force to FIV. An antiviral strategy is useful only when it not only interrupts the virus at a biologically critical point but can also be translated into safe, feasible, and meaningful feline treatment.

The literature also points toward the next frontier of FIV therapeutics. Viral assembly disruption and host restriction enhancement represent two promising future directions. Capsid and assembly-targeted thinking expands the therapeutic model from enzyme inhibition to structural maturation control, while synthetic TRIM5-CypA–based restriction studies suggest that host-directed antiviral defenses may eventually complement direct-acting drugs (Neira, 2009; Prevelige, 2011; Towers, 2007; Dietrich et al., 2010; Dietrich et al., 2011). These approaches are less clinically mature than protease inhibition, but they are conceptually powerful because they diversify the antiviral landscape and may help reduce vulnerability to resistance.

Taken together, the evidence favors a layered therapeutic vision for FIV. Protease inhibitors should remain the central focus of direct antiviral development, but future progress will likely depend on combining that core with structurally informed maturation-targeting approaches and carefully designed host-directed strategies. Such integration offers the best prospect for sustained viral control, mitigation of clinical disease burden, and improved long-term outcomes in infected cats. FIV should therefore be approached not as a neglected antiviral problem with limited options, but as a biologically tractable lentiviral infection whose therapeutic future will be shaped by precision, combination logic, and translational commitment.

References

De Clercq, E. (2004). Antivirals and antiviral strategies. *Nature Reviews Microbiology, 2*, 704–720.

Dietrich, I., Macintyre, A., McMonagle, E., Price, A. J., James, L. C., McEwan, W. A., Hosie, M. J., & Willett, B. J. (2010). Potent lentiviral restriction by a synthetic feline TRIM5 cyclophilin A fusion. *Journal of Virology, 84*, 8980–8985.

Dietrich, I., McEwan, W. A., Hosie, M. J., & Willett, B. J. (2011). Restriction of the felid lentiviruses by a synthetic feline TRIM5-CypA fusion. *Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology, 143*, 235–242.

Elder, J. H., Schnolzer, M., Hasselkus-Light, C. S., Henson, M., Lerner, D. A., Phillips, T. R., Wagaman, P. C., & Kent, S. B. (1993). Identification of proteolytic processing sites within the gag and pol polyproteins of feline immunodeficiency virus. *Journal of Virology, 67*, 1869–1876.

Huitron-Resendiz, S., de Rozieres, S., Sanchez-Alavez, M., Buhler, B., Lin, Y. C., Lerner, D. L., Henriksen, N. W., Burudi, M., Fox, H. S., Torbett, B. E., & others. (2004). Resolution and prevention of feline immunodeficiency virus-induced neurological deficits by treatment with the protease inhibitor TL-3. *Journal of Virology, 78*, 4525–4532.

James, S. H., & Prichard, M. N. (2014). Current and future therapies for herpes simplex virus infections: Mechanism of action and drug resistance. *Current Opinion in Virology, 8*, 54–61.

Kaufman, H. E. (1980). Antimetabolite drug therapy in herpes simplex. *Ophthalmology, 87*, 135–139.

Lee, T., Laco, G. S., Torbett, B. E., Fox, H. S., Lerner, D. L., Elder, J. H., & Wong, C. H. (1998). Analysis of the S3 and S3' subsite specificities of feline immunodeficiency virus protease: Development of a broad-based protease inhibitor efficacious against FIV, SIV, and HIV in vitro and ex vivo. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 95*, 939–944.

Luntz, M. H., & MacCallum, F. O. (1963). Treatment of herpes simplex keratitis with 5-iodo-2'-deoxyuridine. *British Journal of Ophthalmology, 47*, 449–456.

Neira, J. L. (2009). The capsid protein of human immunodeficiency virus: Designing inhibitors of capsid assembly. *FEBS Journal, 276*, 6110–6117.

Norelli, S., El Daker, S., D'Ostilio, D., Mele, F., Mancini, F., Taglia, F., Ruggieri, A., Ciccozzi, M., Cauda, R., Ciervo, A., & others. (2008). Response of feline immunodeficiency virus to tipranavir may provide new clues for development of broad-based inhibitors of retroviral proteases acting on drug-resistant HIV-1. *Current HIV Research, 6*, 306–317.

Prevelige, P. E., Jr. (2011). New approaches for antiviral targeting of HIV assembly. *Journal of Molecular Biology, 410*, 634–640.

Stiles, J. (1995). Treatment of cats with ocular disease attributable to herpesvirus infection: 17 cases (1983–1993). *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 207*, 599–603.

Thomasy, S. M., Shull, O., Outerbridge, C. A. L., et al. (2016). Oral administration of famciclovir for treatment of spontaneous ocular, respiratory or dermatologic disease attributed to feline herpesvirus type-1: A retrospective review in 59 client-owned cats. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*.

Towers, G. J. (2007). The control of viral infection by tripartite motif proteins and cyclophilin A. *Retrovirology, 4*.