



A mechanistic model of primary progressive multiple sclerosis pathogenesis: Integrating genetics, Epstein-Barr virus, and potential tenofovir intervention

Abstract

Primary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis (PPMS), is an aggressive form of Multiple Sclerosis which affects up to 10-15 percent of MS cases. There is a sustained decline in neurological functions with rare inflammatory relapses. This paper addresses the (1) role of shared MS immune - risk genes (HLA-DRB1*15:01 and non- HLA loci), (2) PPMS based CNS - intrinsic variants affecting neuronal resilience) and Epstein -Barr Virus (EBV) infection which induces compartmentalized B- cell inflammation within the CNS [1-4] and the Potential of halting (PPMS) progression with use of Tenofovir Disoproxil/ Alafenamide Fumarate (TDF/TAF).

Keywords: Relapsing remitting multiple sclerosis; Primary progressive multiple sclerosis (PPMS); Epstein barr virus (EBV); HLA-DRB1*15:01, 1q21.1-CHDL/PRKAB2; Tenofovir disoproxil/alafenamide fumarate (TDF/TAF).

Richard Cipian*

Department of Philosophy, California State University, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

***Corresponding author: Richard Cipian**

Department of Philosophy, California State University, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

Email: richardchristopher679@gmail.com

Received: Aug 04, 2026; **Accepted:** Sep 10, 2026;

Published: May 17, 2026

Journal of Neurology and Neurological Sciences

Volume 2 Issue 2 - 2026

www.jnans.org

Cipian R et al. © All rights are reserved

Citation: Cipian R. A mechanistic model of primary progressive multiple sclerosis pathogenesis: Integrating genetics, Epstein-Barr virus, and potential tenofovir intervention. *J Neurol Neuro Sci.* 2026; 2(2): 1030.

Introduction

Multiple Sclerosis is a disorder which manifests as a chronic one which causes inflammation, and neurodegeneration. Clinical courses include relapsing- remitting (RRMS), Secondary Progressive MS (SPMS), and Primary Progressive MS (PPMS) [1,2]. PPMS is characterized by spinal predominance, presence of diffuse lesions and meningeal B-cell aggregates. There is chronic microglial activation at lesion rims. This characteristic is linked to steady disability without prominent relapses [3,4]. Primary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis (PPMS) is characterized by neurological decline with limited response to existing disease-modifying therapies. There is strong epidemiological association with Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) infection [1,2]. Growing evidence implicates EBV-infected B cells and their lytic reactivation are implicated in MS pathogenesis [3-5].

Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate (TDF) and Tenofovir Alafenamide (TAF), are used as nucleotide reverse transcriptase

inhibitors in HIV and hepatitis B therapy. They have the feature of inhibiting EBV DNA polymerase and lytic replication in vitro. TAF displays higher potency than TDF against EBV in some assays [31,32]. Case reports of MS patients on tenofovir-containing antiretroviral regimens describe prolonged clinical and MRI stability. There is renewed disease activity after tenofovir withdrawal. This suggests a possible disease-modifying effect mediated by EBV suppression [31-34]. TAF is being tested as an add-on to existing Multiple Sclerosis therapies in early-phase clinical trials in Relapsing-Remitting MS (RRMS) with virologic and neuroaxonal endpoints, but no trials specifically target PPMS [35-37].

There are >200 MS susceptibility loci, primarily immune-related and shared across subtypes identified by Genome-wide Association Studies (GWAS). HLA-DRB1*15:01 confers the strongest risk [5,6]. Progression-focused analyses examine severity loci which are enriched in neuronal/synaptic/ mitochondrial pathways. It is possible that PPMS induces

amplified neurodegeneration on top of a foundation where there is increased genetic susceptibility [7,8]. EBV infection and seroconversion is linked with increased risk due to B-cell dysregulation and molecular mimicry [9-11]. TDF/TAF may be a targeted intervention in reducing progression and potentially halting PPMS.

Genetic architecture of PPMS

Shared polygenic risk in PPMS and RRMS is present because of shared polygenic risk where there is due presence of susceptibility loci, with similar HLA-DRB1*15:01 effecting sizes and polygenic scores [6,13]. T/B-cell activation is modulated by Non-HLA loci (e.g., IL2RA, IL7R, CD40). This creates a common autoimmune predisposition [5,6].

Loci which influences disability accrual that is independent of relapses is identified by severity GWAS. Synaptic integrity (e.g., GRIN2A), mitochondrial function (e.g., MT-ND genes), and lipid metabolism are targeted (7,8). The 1q21.1 locus shows PPMS bias because hypermethylation alters CHD1L (chromatin remodeler, DNA repair) and PRKAB2 (AMPK subunit, energy sensing) expression. Impairing of neuronal stress responses in iPSC/zebrafish models is observed [14].

EBV as pathogenic trigger

There is disruption of EBV latency in memory B cells. HLA-DRB1*15:01 promotes molecular mimicry. There is EBV peptide presentation which mimics myelin (e.g., EBNA1 cross-reacts with GlialCAM). Variants in TNFRSF1A/CD40 weaken control of viral replication. This yields exhausted CD8+ T cells and expanded EBV+ autoreactive B cells [9-11,15]. Mononucleosis amplifies risk 32-fold [9].

Compartmentalized inflammation in PPMS

There is EBV+ B cellular infiltration across the blood-meningeal barrier. This causes development of follicle-like aggregates. There is then production of oligoclonal bands and cytokines [3,16]. Microglia/astrocyte activation is observed which influences paramagnetic rim lesion development with iron/complement-mediated axonal loss. There is remyelination failure due to the EBV+ B cells infiltration [4,17]. CHD1L-deficient neurons exhibit oxidative/mitochondrial stress that accelerates “smoldering” damage. Perhaps this is behind PPMS’s insidious course [14,18].

EBV establishes lifelong latency in B cells. There is periodic lytic reactivation of EBV from latently infected B cells and is linked to B-cell activation and differentiation into plasmablasts and plasma cells [3-5,13]. EBV-infected B cells appear to be over-represented or dysregulated in peripheral blood. This is also observed in meningeal and perivascular aggregates in the CNS. Such cells act as antigen-presenting cells, cytokine sources, and antibody producers [3-5]. Chronic, low-grade EBV activity in reservoirs is hypothesized to provide continuous antigenic stimulation for autoreactive T cells. There is driving of local microglial activation and oxidative injury. This sustains compartmentalized inflammation in progressive stages [28-30].

This model is consistent with the relative success of B-cell-depleting therapies in both RRMS and PPMS, but also with their limitations: anti-CD20 antibodies spare long-lived plasma cells and some CD20-negative memory subsets that may continue to harbor EBV [1,14,38].

PPMS pathology is dominated by diffuse microglial activation

in normal-appearing white and grey matter. There is meningeal inflammation with cortical demyelination, and slowly expanding lesions. Inactive rims develop rather than frequent gadolinium-enhancing foci [26,7,40]. These observations fit a scenario where ongoing local immune activation driven by EBV-infected B-cell/plasma-cell populations damages axons and neurons over time without frequent large relapses [28-30,40]. It is hoped that a drug that specifically reduces EBV lytic activity in those cells could attenuate this chronic neuroinflammatory drive.

Integrated mechanistic model

An integrated model suggests that there is Genetic priming due to Immune-risk alleles and added CNS vulnerability (1q21.1 etc.) [5-8,14]. Then there is the EBV hit where EBV latency expands EBV+ autoreactive B cells [9-11]. CNS seeding would occur where meningeal niches develop and there is sustaining of low-grade inflammation [3,16]. Neurodegeneration occurs as a function of microglial oxidative bursts which erode genetically fragile axons [4,17,18].

PPMS phenotype: Continuous progression sans relapses characterizes PPMS [1,2].

Tenofovir fumarate: Mechanistic rationale

TDF/TAF’s metabolite (tenofovir-diphosphate) inhibits EBV DNA polymerase (Ki ~0.5 μM, clinically achievable), blocking lytic reactivation and late-gene expression in B cells [19]. This may curtail EBV reservoir replenishment [19,20] and lead to contracting of pathogenic B-cell clones feeding meningeal niches [10,15]. There could be an expected attenuation of smoldering inflammation and microglial activation [3,4].

TDF stabilized RRMS according to an anecdotal case series report. A clinical TAF-MS trial (NCT04880577) testing EBV suppression is ongoing [20,21]. In PPMS, synergy with ocrelizumab/BTKi is possible, treating MS patients with high-EBV genetic vulnerability [12,22].

Tenofovir prodrugs (TDF and TAF) are converted intracellularly to tenofovir diphosphate. It then competes with natural nucleotides and there is termination of DNA synthesis by viral polymerases [32]. Tenofovir also inhibits EBV DNA polymerase and viral DNA replication in cell culture. TAF is reported to be roughly twice as potent as ganciclovir in some in-vitro assays [38]. There is improvement of the therapeutic index because TAF achieves higher intracellular levels in lymphoid cells than TDF at lower plasma concentrations [32].

EBV lytic reactivation leads to plasmablast and plasma cell differentiation. These cells are not adequately targeted by anti-CD20 therapies in that depletion does not occur [28,39]. Eliminating EBV lytic DNA replication in these cells by tenofovir use could decrease viral antigen load, virion release, and EBV-driven inflammatory signaling within CNS-associated B-cell niches [31,38].

There is a case report of a woman who sustained clinical and MRI remission with no new lesion development due to Tenofovir use over several years. After the patient stopped tenofovir use she experienced renewed inflammatory disease activity [31,33].

There are other reports of HIV-positive MS patients on tenofovir-containing regimens that have shown long-term clinical and MRI stability. This could mean that such treatment

is compatible with an anti-EBV effect [8,9,16]. There is a rationale paper explicitly proposing tenofovir as a treatment option for MS, and calling for dedicated clinical trials [32]. These observations have contributed to the design of RRMS trials testing TAF as add-on therapy. There are endpoints including EBV shedding, neurofilament light chain (NfL), and microglial activation [35-37].

Reduction of EBV lytic activity in CNS-associated B cells

Chronic, compartmentalized immune activation within the CNS is believed to perpetuate PPMS [27,41]. Repeated cycles of EBV lytic reactivation in plasmablasts/plasma cells and CD20-negative memory B cells could continuously promote local antigen presentation (EBV and cross-reactive self-antigens), pro-inflammatory cytokine production, and recruitment and activation of microglia and astrocytes [28,29].

By inhibiting EBV DNA polymerase, tenofovir could reduce lytic cycles. There would be a reduction in the frequency and magnitude of local EBV antigen bursts and the release of EBV virions capable of infecting additional B cells. Downstream microglial activation and oxidative stress would also be reduced [27,32,35-36]. This could slow further neuroaxonal loss, translating clinically into reduced progression rates though it may not replace lost myelin to a full extent.

Synergy with B-cell-depleting therapy

Ocrelizumab is approved for PPMS. It significantly slows disability progression. Though there are incomplete responses [26,28]. CD20-negative plasma cells and some tissue-resident memory B cells survive and an EBV reservoir is maintained [39]. Combining tenofovir with anti-CD20 therapy could, in theory, target the entire EBV reservoir by affecting peripheral B cell EBV niches while tenofovir reduces lytic CNS EBV replication [6,7,13,14].

Modulation of innate immune activation

EBV lytic products, including viral DNA and proteins, can activate innate sensors in microglia and astrocytes (e.g., TLR9, cGAS–STING), driving chronic production of pro-inflammatory mediators and reactive oxygen/nitrogen species [28-30,40]. By reducing EBV replication and virion production, tenofovir could indirectly lower microglial translocator protein (TSPO) expression [28-30,35-37]. This would reduce cortical pathology. Neurofilament light proteins (NfL) levels and TSPO-PET imaging, already planned as endpoints in RRMS TAF trials, are appropriate biomarkers to test this mechanism in PPMS [35-46].

Alternative or complementary mechanisms

Tenofovir may inhibit reverse transcriptase activity of Human Endogenous Retrovirus (HERV) elements. Such elements have been suggested to have a role in MS pathogenesis. The idea is that reducing HERV expression could reduce innate immune activation and autoimmunity [32,41]. In HIV-positive individuals, antiretroviral therapy also alters T-cell subsets and systemic immune activation. There could also be immune modulatory effects in those without HIV disease [32,47].

Relevance to PPMS versus RRMS

Since PPMS is more strongly associated with spinal cord and diffuse grey matter damage [26,27,40], compartmentalized CNS inflammation and meningeal aggregates which do not respond fully to systemic immunosuppression, makes a direct

antiviral intervention attractive [28-30,44]. Reducing EBV lytic reactivation which is behind smoldering damage might have a stronger effect on reducing MS pathology than just combating traditional relapses since relapses are T cell driven [28-30,38]. Data on tenofovir use for PPMS is unavailable [31-34]. It is unknown if EBV lytic activity is higher in PPMS versus RRMS even though PPMS involves chronic neurodegeneration [26,28,32].

Hypothesis to evidence

Quantifying EBV lytic and latent gene expression in CSF cells is justified in clinical trials. CNS tissue from PPMS versus RRMS patients should be assessed to see if there is a reduction of EBV-infected B-cell subsets in blood and CSF. This should be correlated with markers of progression (EDSS, NfL, imaging) [3-5,13]. In vitro work should be done where EBV-infected B cells derived from PPMS patients are assessed for TDF/TAF effects on lytic reactivation, cytokine profiles, and interactions with microglia [32,38]. TSPO-PET measures of microglial activation, spinal cord and brain atrophy rates, and clinical progression could be used as endpoints [26,28,35-37].

A multicenter, placebo-controlled trial of TAF add-ons to ocrelizumab or best standard care in PPMS could be justified. Stratification by EBV activity markers and relevant genetic determinants (e.g., HLA, KIR) could help identify responder subgroups. This would use composite progression endpoints with imaging and fluid biomarkers [26-28,35-37]. Adoptive EBV-specific CD8 T cells infused to target infected B cells—could be considered [30,41].

Discussion

This model suggests that primary infection with EBV in genetically susceptible individuals with haplotypes associated with PPMS can be treated with tenofovir and use of ocrelizumab as adjunct. Tenofovir would act on both peripheral and CNS derived EBV lytic replication while ocrelizumab would assist in reducing the EBV reservoir in the periphery. Hopefully there would be a reduction of smoldering activity in the CNS and a halting of MS progression [25].

Conclusion

This model of PPMS pathogenesis integrates shared genetics, EBV-driven B-cell pathology, and CNS fragility. TDF/TAF offers a testable adjunct by disrupting viral perpetuation of smoldering inflammation consistent with the relative success of B-cell-depleting therapies in both RRMS and PPMS, but also with their limitations: anti-CD20 antibodies spare long-lived plasma cells and some CD20-negative memory subsets that may continue to harbor EBV [1,14,38].

These features fit a scenario where ongoing local immune activation, possibly driven by EBV-infected B-cell/plasma-cell populations, gradually damages axons and neurons without frequent large relapses [7,26,28-30,40]. Tenofovir would target EBV lytic activity and attenuate reduce chronic neuroinflammation.

References

1. Lublin FD, Reingold SC, Cohen JA, Cutter GR, Sørensen PS, Thompson AJ, et al. Defining the clinical course of multiple sclerosis: the 2013 revisions. *Neurology*. 2014; 83: 278-286.
2. Cree BAC, Gourraud PA, Oksenberg JR, et al. Long-term evolution of multiple sclerosis severity in the US health claims database. *Neurology*. 2016; 86: 2326-2333.

3. Lassmann H. Pathology and disease mechanisms in different stages of multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Sci.* 2013; 333: 1-4.
4. Frischer JM, Bramow S, Dal-Bianco A, Lucchinetti CF, Rauschka H, Schmidbauer M, et al. The relation between inflammation and neurodegeneration in multiple sclerosis brains. *Brain.* 2009; 132: 1175-1189.
5. International Multiple Sclerosis Genetics Consortium. Multiple sclerosis genomic map implicates peripheral immune cells and microglia in susceptibility. *Science.* 2019; 365: eaav7188.
6. Cree BAC, Hollenbach JA, Bove R, et al. A major histocompatibility class I locus contributes to multiple sclerosis susceptibility independently from HLA-DRB1*15:01. *PLoS One.* 2010; 5: e11296.
7. International Multiple Sclerosis Genetics Consortium. Genetic risk and a primary role for cell-mediated immune mechanisms in multiple sclerosis. *Nature.* 2011; 476: 214-219.
8. Patsopoulos NA. Genetics of multiple sclerosis: an overview and new directions. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med.* 2018; 8: a028951.
9. Bjornevik K, Cortese M, Healy BC, et al. Longitudinal analysis reveals high prevalence of Epstein-Barr virus associated with multiple sclerosis. *Science.* 2022; 375: 296-301.
10. Ascherio A, Munger KL. Epstein-Barr virus infection and multiple sclerosis: a review. *J Neuroimmune Pharmacol.* 2010; 5: 271-277.
11. Lanz TV, Brewer RC, Ho PP, Moon JS, Jude KM, Fernandez D, et al. Clonally expanded B cells in multiple sclerosis bind EBV EBNA1 and GlialCAM. *Nature.* 2022; 603: 321-327.
12. Giovannoni G. Targeting Epstein-Barr virus in multiple sclerosis: when and how? *Curr Opin Neurol.* 2024; 37: 228-236.
13. Hedström AK, Hössjer O, Katsoulis M, Kockum I, Olsson T, Alfredsson L. Organic solvents and MS susceptibility: interaction with MS risk HLA genes. *Neurology.* 2018; 91: e455-e462.
14. Pahlevan Kakhki M, Giordano A, Starvaggi Cucuzza C, Venkata S Badam T, Samudyata S, Lemée MV, et al. A genetic-epigenetic interplay at 1q21.1 locus underlies CHD1L-mediated vulnerability to primary progressive multiple sclerosis. *Nat Commun.* 2024; 15: 6419.
15. Serafini B, Muzio L, Rosicarelli B, Aloisi F. Radioactive in situ hybridization for Epstein-Barr virus-encoded small RNA supports presence of Epstein-Barr virus in the multiple sclerosis brain. *Brain.* 2013; 136: e233.
16. Magliozzi R, Howell O, Vora A, Serafini B, Nicholas R, Puopolo M, et al. Meningeal B-cell follicles in secondary progressive multiple sclerosis associate with early onset of disease and severe cortical pathology. *Brain.* 2007; 130: 1089-1104.
17. Absinta M, Sati P, Masuzzo F, Nair G, Sethi V, Kolb H, et al. Association of chronic active multiple sclerosis lesions with disability in vivo. *JAMA Neurol.* 2019; 76: 1474-1483.
18. Mahad D, Ziabreva I, Lassmann H, Turnbull D. Mitochondrial defects in acute multiple sclerosis lesions. *Brain.* 2008; 131: 1722-1735.
19. Drosu NC, Edelman ER, Housman DE. Tenofovir prodrugs potently inhibit Epstein-Barr virus lytic DNA replication by targeting the viral DNA polymerase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2020; 117: 12368-12374.
20. Torkildsen Ø, Myhr KM, Skogen V, Steffensen LH, Bjørnevik K. Tenofovir as a treatment option for multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2020; 46: 102569.
21. Tenofovir alafenamide for treatment of multiple sclerosis (TAF-MS). *ClinicalTrials.gov* identifier: NCT04880577. 2025.
22. Montalban X, Hauser SL, Kappos L, Arnold DL, Bar-Or A, Comi G, et al. Ocrelizumab versus placebo in primary progressive multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.* 2017; 376: 209-220.
23. Reynolds R, Roncaroli F, Nicholas R, Radotra B, Gveric D, Howell O. The neuropathological basis of clinical progression in multiple sclerosis. *Acta Neuropathol.* 2011; 122: 155-170.
24. Lucchinetti CF, Popescu BF, Bunyan RF, Moll NM, Roemer SF, Lassmann H, et al. Inflammatory cortical demyelination in early multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.* 2011; 365: 2188-2197.
25. Martinelli V, Dalla Costa G, Messina MJ, Di Maggio G, Sangalli F, Moiola L, et al. Multiple biomarkers improve the prediction of multiple sclerosis in clinically isolated syndromes. *Acta Neurol Scand.* 2017; 136: 454-461.
26. Meier UC, Cipian RC, Karimi A, Ramasamy R, Middeldorp JM. Cumulative roles for Epstein-Barr virus, human endogenous retroviruses, and human herpes virus-6 in driving an inflammatory cascade underlying MS pathogenesis. *Front Immunol.* 2021; 12: 757302.
27. Prajwal P, Marsool MDM, Asharaf S, Inban P, Gadam S, Yadav R, et al. Comparison of recent updates in genetics, immunology, biomarkers, and neuroimaging of primary-progressive and relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis and the role of ocrelizumab in the management of their refractory cases. *Health Sci Rep.* 2023; 6: e1422.
28. Chatterjee D, Meloni C, Marnetto F, Fagnani C, Benincasa M, et al. EBV dysregulation is associated with immune imbalance in multiple sclerosis. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm.* 2026.
29. Pender MP, Csurhes PA, Pfluger CM, Burrows SR. Decreased CD8+ T cell response to Epstein-Barr virus infected B cells in multiple sclerosis is not due to decreased HLA class I expression on B cells or monocytes. *BMC Neurol.* 2011; 11: 95.
30. Veroni C, Aloisi F. The CD8 T cell-Epstein-Barr virus-B cell triologue: a central issue in multiple sclerosis pathogenesis. *Front Immunol.* 2021; 12: 665718.
31. Torkildsen Ø, Myhr KM, Brugger-Synnes P, Bjørnevik K. Antiviral therapy with tenofovir in MS. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2024; 83: 105436.
32. Torkildsen Ø, Myhr KM, Skogen V, Steffensen LH, Bjørnevik K. Tenofovir as a treatment option for multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2020; 46: 102569.
33. Case study reports positive impact of antiviral therapy – tenofovir in MS, warranting further research. *NeurologyLive.* 2024.
34. Drosu N, Bjornevik K, Bilodeau P, Levy M. Long-term MRI and clinical stability in an HIV-positive patient with multiple sclerosis on tenofovir: a case report. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* 2024; 83: 105397.
35. *ClinicalTrials.gov*. NCT04880577: Tenofovir alafenamide for treatment of symptoms and neuroprotection in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis.
36. Neuro-SysMed. The TAF-MS 1 study: tenofovir alafenamide in RRMS patients on natalizumab. *Helse Bergen.* 2025.
37. Neuro-SysMed. The TAF-MS 2 study: tenofovir alafenamide as add-on to anti-CD20 therapy in multiple sclerosis. *Helse Bergen.* 2025.
38. Young LS, Rickinson AB. Epstein-Barr virus: 40 years on. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2004; 4: 757-768.

39. Perosa F, Prete M, Racanelli V, Dammacco F. CD20-depleting therapy in autoimmune diseases: from basic research to the clinic. *J Intern Med*. 2010; 267: 260-277.
40. Mahad DH, Trapp BD, Lassmann H. Pathological mechanisms in progressive multiple sclerosis. *Lancet Neurol*. 2015; 14: 183-193.
41. Skarlis C, Gontika M, Katsavos S, Velonakis G, Toulas P, Anagnostouli M. Multiple sclerosis and subsequent human immunodeficiency virus infection: a case with the rare comorbidity, focus on novel treatment issues and review of the literature. *In Vivo*. 2017; 31: 1041-1046.
42. Küry P, Nath A, Créange A, Dolei A, Marche P, Gold J, et al. Human endogenous retroviruses in neurological diseases. *Trends Mol Med*. 2018; 24: 379-394.
43. Pender MP, Csurhes PA, Smith C, Douglas NL, Neller MA, Matthews KK, et al. Epstein-Barr virus-specific T cell therapy for progressive multiple sclerosis. *JCI Insight*. 2018; 3: e124714.
44. Torkildsen Ø, Myhr KM, Skogen V, Steffensen LH, Bjørnevik K. Tenofovir as a treatment option for multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. 2020; 46: 102569.
45. Torkildsen Ø, Holmøy T, Myhr KM. Antiviral therapy with tenofovir in MS. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. 2024; 80: 105063.
46. Torkildsen Ø, Bru ANS, Behzadi GIN, Myhr KM. Successful treatment of progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy with tenofovir alafenamide fumarate. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm*. 2026; 13: e200522.
47. Stefanou MI, Krumbholz M, Ziemann U, Kowarik MC. Human immunodeficiency virus and multiple sclerosis: a review of the literature. *Neurol Res Pract*. 2019; 1: 24.