Microbiology Research Journal International

Volume 34, Issue 12, Page 106-121, 2024; Article no.MRJI.127741
ISSN: 2456-7043, NLM ID: 101726596
(Past name: British Microbiology Research Journal, Past ISSN: 2231-0886, NLM ID: 101608140)

Genetic Engineering in Insect Management: New Frontiers in Pest Control

Sunita Yadav [a++], Samreen [b++], Satyabrata Sarangi [c++], Shradha Parmar [d++], Mamatha Thodusu [e#], Suraj Soni [f++] and Kartikey Pandey [g++*]

[a] Department of Entomology, Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, India.
[b] Division of Entomology, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi,110012, India.
[c] Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India.
[d] Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Gwalior, India.
[e] Department of Entomology, Uttara Banga Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, West Bengal, India.
[f] Department of Entomology, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India.
[g] Department of Plant Pathology Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/mrji/2024/v34i121514

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/127741

Review Article

Received: 04/10/2024
Accepted: 06/12/2024
Published: 10/12/2024

[++] Ph.D. Scholar;
[#] PG. Scholar;
**Corresponding author: E-mail: Kartikep03@gmail.com;*

Cite as: *Yadav, Sunita, Samreen, Satyabrata Sarangi, Shradha Parmar, Mamatha Thodusu, Suraj Soni, and Kartikey Pandey. 2024. "Genetic Engineering in Insect Management: New Frontiers in Pest Control". Microbiology Research Journal International 34 (12):106-21. https://doi.org/10.9734/mrji/2024/v34i121514.*

ABSTRACT

Genetic engineering is transforming the landscape of pest management, offering innovative solutions to longstanding challenges in agriculture and public health. Traditional methods, such as chemical pesticides, have led to significant ecological harm and widespread resistance among pests, necessitating new strategies for sustainable control. Advanced technologies, including CRISPR-Cas9, RNA interference (RNAi), and gene drives, have emerged as powerful tools to precisely target pest species while minimizing off-target effects. CRISPR enables precise genome editing, offering ways to suppress populations of disease vectors like Anopheles gambiae, which transmits malaria, while RNAi provides species-specific pest control by silencing essential genes. Gene drives can propagate beneficial traits through populations to curb the spread of vector-borne diseases. Technical challenges like off-target mutations, resistance development, and delivery barriers for RNAi remain significant hurdles. Integrating these genetic tools with traditional Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approaches could enhance sustainability by reducing reliance on chemical pesticides and promoting ecological balance. The use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in pest control also raises ethical and ecological concerns, particularly regarding the release of gene drive organisms that could irreversibly alter ecosystems. Addressing these challenges requires robust regulatory frameworks, international collaboration, and effective public engagement to foster trust. Public skepticism, often fueled by misinformation, poses a barrier to acceptance, highlighting the need for transparent communication and community involvement. Field trials, such as the release of genetically modified Aedes aegypti mosquitoes in Brazil and Florida, have shown promising results in reducing disease transmission, yet scaling up these efforts requires significant investment and regulatory clarity. Future research priorities include refining gene-editing precision, developing self-limiting gene drives, and enhancing RNAi delivery systems. By advancing interdisciplinary research and fostering global cooperation, the scientific community can harness genetic technologies to create more sustainable and effective pest control solutions, ultimately securing food systems and public health while mitigating environmental impact.

Keywords: CRISPR; RNAi; gene drives; pesticides; mosquitoes; resistance; sustainability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Insect pests present a significant challenge to global agriculture and food security, with severe economic and social consequences. It is estimated that pests account for a 20-40% reduction in global crop yields annually, causing billions of dollars in economic losses and exacerbating food shortages, particularly in developing regions (Mlambo et al., 2024). For example, the desert locust (*Schistocerca gregaria*) is one of the most destructive pests, capable of consuming its body weight in crops each day. A single swarm can devour enough food in a day to sustain 35,000 people, threatening the livelihoods of millions of smallholder farmers across Africa and Asia. As the global population is projected to reach 9.7 billion by 2050, improving pest management strategies is important to ensuring food security. In their impact on agriculture, insect pests are also vectors for some of the most severe vector-borne diseases. Mosquitoes, transmit pathogens that cause diseases like malaria, dengue fever, and Zika virus, leading to significant morbidity and mortality worldwide. The World Health Organization reports that malaria alone caused around 619,000 deaths in 2022, with the vast majority occurring in sub-Saharan Africa. The recent emergence of the Zika virus in Latin America during 2015-2016 underscored the public health risk posed by *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes, which have been associated with birth defects such as microcephaly (Kotsakiozi et al. 2017). These challenges emphasize the need for innovative solutions to control both agricultural pests and disease vectors.

1.1 Limitations of Conventional Pest Control

The most common approach to pest management has traditionally involved the use of chemical pesticides. These methods are increasingly ineffective due to the development of resistance. Currently, more than 500 species of pests have developed resistance to one or more pesticides, significantly diminishing the efficacy of chemical control measures. Widespread resistance to pyrethroids has been reported in *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes, reducing the effectiveness of these chemicals in controlling dengue and Zika outbreaks. As resistance builds, farmers are forced into a "pesticide treadmill," where they must apply higher doses or more toxic chemicals, which escalates costs and increases risks to both human health and the environment (Ward 1994). The environmental and health risks associated with chemical pesticide use are well documented. Studies have shown that these chemicals can have detrimental effects on non-target species, particularly beneficial insects such as bees and pollinators, which play a important role in maintaining biodiversity and crop production. A long-term study found that 75% of insect biomass has been lost over the last 27 years in protected areas due to factors such as pesticide exposure. Chronic exposure to pesticides has been linked to health issues in humans, especially among agricultural workers, including increased risks of cancers, neurological disorders, and reproductive problems. As a result, there is growing regulatory pressure in regions like the European Union to reduce the use of hazardous pesticides and promote sustainable alternatives (Lamichhane et al. 2016).

1.2 Emergence of Genetic Engineering

To overcome the limitations of conventional methods, genetic engineering has emerged as a promising and innovative approach to insect pest management. Genetic engineering involves directly modifying the DNA of organisms to achieve specific traits, such as sterility or reduced disease transmission capabilities. Techniques like CRISPR-Cas9 and RNA interference (RNAi) allow scientists to edit the genomes of insects with high precision, enabling targeted pest control strategies that minimize harm to non-target species. One of the major advantages of genetic engineering over traditional pesticides is its specificity. Genetic modifications can be designed to target only the pest species of interest, thereby reducing collateral damage to ecosystems and beneficial organisms (Devos et al. 2022). Researchers have developed gene drives in mosquitoes that spread genetic modifications throughout wild populations, potentially reducing or even eradicating populations of disease-carrying species like *Anopheles gambiae*, which transmits malaria. Genetic approaches can be more sustainable in the long term, as they often do not require continuous application, unlike chemical pesticides.

1.3 Purpose of the Review

The purpose of this review is to explore recent advancements in genetic technologies for insect pest management, with a focus on emerging techniques such as CRISPR, gene drives, and RNAi. These technologies have shown significant potential in controlled experiments and initial field trials. The release of genetically engineered *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes in Brazil resulted in an 80% reduction in local mosquito populations (Carvalho et al. 2015). Despite these promising developments, there are still substantial challenges to consider, including the risk of resistance developing against genetic interventions, ethical concerns about the release of genetically modified organisms into natural ecosystems, and the regulatory frameworks needed to govern their use. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the current state of genetic pest control technologies, discuss their potential benefits and drawbacks, and highlight future directions for research. It will also address the ethical, ecological, and regulatory considerations that must be addressed before these technologies can be widely implemented. By examining the most recent advancements and ongoing challenges, this review seeks to contribute to the broader conversation about sustainable pest management solutions in an era of increasing ecological and agricultural pressures (Savary et al. 2012).

2. HISTORY OF PEST CONTROL

2.1 Traditional Pest Control Methods

Chemical Pesticides and Insecticides For decades, chemical pesticides have been the cornerstone of pest management, playing a critical role in enhancing agricultural productivity. The widespread adoption of pesticides, especially since the advent of synthetic chemicals like DDT in the 1940s, led to a significant reduction in pest populations and an increase in crop yields. DDT was instrumental in eradicating malaria in many parts of the world. The overuse and misuse of chemical pesticides have resulted in several unintended consequences. By the 1990s, more than 500 pest species had developed resistance to at least one class of pesticides, including major groups like organophosphates, carbamates, and pyrethroids (Shad et al. 2012). This resistance has rendered many pesticides less effective, forcing farmers to apply higher doses, thereby increasing production costs and environmental risks. Chemical pesticides also pose significant risks to non-target organisms, such as beneficial insects, birds, and aquatic life. For example, neonicotinoids, a widely used class of insecticides, have been linked to the decline in pollinator populations, particularly honeybees, which are important for the pollination of many crops. The environmental persistence of certain chemicals like DDT, which can remain in ecosystems for decades, led to its ban in many countries by the early 1970s, following Rachel Carson's influential book, *Silent Spring* (Harrison et al. 1970). Biological Control (e.g., Predators, Parasitoids) Biological control involves the use of natural predators, parasitoids, or pathogens to control pest populations. This method was one of the earliest forms of pest management, dating back centuries. One notable example is the introduction of the vedalia beetle (*Rodolia cardinalis*) to California in the late 1800s to control the cottony cushion scale (*Icerya purchasi*) on citrus crops, which saved the citrus industry from collapse. Biological control has the advantage of being environmentally friendly, as it reduces the need for chemical inputs. It is not without challenges; biological agents may not always establish well in new environments, and there is a risk of non-target effects, as seen in the case of the cane toad in Australia (Goettel & Hajek 2001). Cultural Practices (e.g., Crop Rotation) Cultural pest control methods involve manipulating agricultural practices to reduce pest incidence. Crop rotation, for example, helps break the life cycle of pests that are host-specific. Historically, the practice of rotating crops like corn and soybeans has been used to control pests such as the corn rootworm (*Diabroticavirgifera virgifera*), which thrives in continuous corn cropping systems. Intercropping, altering planting dates, and using trap crops are effective cultural practices that can reduce pest pressure while enhancing soil health and crop diversity. These methods require extensive planning and are often labor-intensive, limiting their adoption in large-scale commercial farming (Deininger & Byerlee 2012).

2.2 Early Biotechnological Approaches

Use of Microbial Insecticides (e.g., *Bacillus thuringiensis*) The use of microbial insecticides marked a shift towards more sustainable pest control solutions in the mid-20th century. The bacterium *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) was discovered in 1911 and later commercialized as a biological pesticide. Bt produces toxins that are highly specific to certain insect larvae, making it a popular choice for controlling pests like the European corn borer and diamondback moth. Unlike chemical pesticides, Bt is considered environmentally safe due to its specificity, which reduces harm to non-target species. Bt microbial sprays have been used extensively in organic agriculture and have led to the development of genetically modified crops containing Bt genes, such as Bt corn and Bt cotton. These crops produce the same insecticidal proteins found in Bt sprays, providing continuous protection against pests throughout the growing season (Sanchis 2011). According to the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications, Bt crops are grown on over 100 million hectares worldwide, significantly reducing the need for chemical insecticide applications and providing substantial economic benefits to farmers, particularly in developing countries. Genetically Modified Crops with Insect-Resistant Traits (e.g., Bt Crops) The introduction of genetically modified (GM) crops in the 1990s revolutionized pest management in agriculture. Bt crops, engineered to express insecticidal proteins from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, have been highly effective in controlling major pests such as the cotton bollworm and the European corn borer. Studies have shown that Bt crops can reduce pesticide use by 30-50%, leading to both economic and environmental benefits. In India, the adoption of Bt cotton led to a 24% increase in yields and a significant reduction in pesticide use, benefiting over 6 million smallholder farmers (Krishna & Qaim 2012). Despite their success, the widespread use of Bt crops has raised concerns about the potential for resistance development in target pests. Cases of resistance have been documented in the fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) in the Americas and the pink bollworm (*Pectinophora gossypiella*) in India, which threatens the long-term efficacy of these technologies. This has led to the development of refuge strategies, where non-Bt crops are planted alongside Bt varieties to slow resistance evolution.

2.3 Need for Innovative Approaches

Increasing Resistance to Existing Methods The overuse of both chemical and biotechnological pest control strategies has led to increasing resistance among target pest populations (Table 1). For example, within just a decade of its introduction, the western corn rootworm developed resistance to Bt corn, posing a significant challenge to corn growers in

Table 1. Innovative approaches in pest control in entomology

Innovative Approach	Description	Examples	Advantages	Challenges
Biological Control	Utilization of natural enemies (predators, parasitoids, pathogens) to suppress pest populations.	Release of *Trichogramma* spp. for caterpillar control; Bacillus thuringiensis sprays.	Eco-friendly, reduces chemical pesticide use, promotes biodiversity.	Requires specific conditions, may be slow-acting, limited target specificity.
Integrated Pest Management (IPM)	Combining cultural, biological, mechanical, and chemical controls for sustainable pest management.	Use of pheromone traps, crop rotation, and selective insecticides.	Reduces environmental impact, minimizes resistance development.	High initial implementation cost, requires farmer training and monitoring.
Genetic Control	Alteration of pest genetics to reduce populations or render them sterile.	Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) for fruit fly control; CRISPR-based gene drives.	Permanent solution, targets specific pests.	Expensive, potential ecological risks, public acceptance issues.
Behavioral Control	Disrupting pest behavior through pheromones or attractants.	Pheromone traps for monitoring and trapping; push-pull strategies.	Non-toxic, species-specific, minimizes pesticide use.	Limited to certain species, requires knowledge of pest behavior.
Nano-pesticides	Application of nanotechnology to improve pesticide efficacy and reduce environmental impact.	Nano-encapsulated pesticides for slow-release; silica nanoparticles for pest control.	Improved delivery, reduced pesticide usage, long-lasting effects.	High development cost, potential unknown toxicity.
RNA Interference (RNAi) Technology	Gene silencing mechanism to disrupt pest protein synthesis.	RNAi sprays targeting essential pest genes for survival.	Specific, environmentally safe, reduced resistance risk.	Expensive, regulatory challenges, stability issues in field conditions.
Robotics and AI in Pest Management	Use of drones, robots, and AI algorithms for pest monitoring and precision spraying.	Drone-based spraying; AI-based pest identification systems.	Precise, labor-saving, effective over large areas.	High cost, need for technical expertise, accessibility issues for small-scale farmers.
Plant-Incorporated Protectants (PIPs)	Genetically modified plants expressing pest-resistant traits.	Bt cotton and Bt maize.	Long-term control, reduced pesticide use, improved crop yields.	Public resistance, regulatory restrictions, potential resistance development in pests.
Endophytic Fungi and Microbiomes	Use of endophytic microorganisms to enhance plant resistance to pests.	Colonization of plants with entomopathogenic fungi like *Beauveria bassiana*.	Promotes plant health, natural pest deterrence, environmentally sustainable.	Lack of standardized protocols, variable efficacy across conditions.
Climate-Smart Pest Management	Adjusting pest control strategies to account for changing climate conditions.	Timing pesticide applications based on predictive pest models.	Reduces pesticide wastage, effective in dynamic environmental scenarios.	Requires accurate climate data, advanced forecasting tools.

(Source: (Harvey-Samuel et al. 2021, Burt et al. 2018))

the United States. Pests like the diamondback moth (*Plutella xylostella*) have shown resistance to almost every insecticide class, including Bt toxins, highlighting the urgent need for new pest management solutions (Harvey-Samuel et al. 2021). Shift Toward Genetic Solutions for Sustainability As resistance to current control methods grows, there is a clear need to shift towards innovative genetic solutions that are both sustainable and environmentally friendly. Recent advances in genetic engineering, such as CRISPR-Cas9, gene drives, and RNA interference, offer promising avenues for targeted pest control with reduced ecological impact. These technologies enable precise genetic modifications in pest populations, potentially providing long-term solutions to issues like insecticide resistance while minimizing harm to non-target species and ecosystems. Gene drive technology in mosquitoes aims to reduce populations of vectors responsible for malaria transmission, which could save millions of lives in regions where the disease is endemic (Burt et al. 2018). The development and adoption of these innovative genetic approaches require careful consideration of ecological, ethical, and regulatory implications. Nevertheless, they represent a promising frontier in pest management that could help address the limitations of traditional methods and biotechnological interventions, ensuring food security and protecting public health in the years to come.

3. GENETIC ENGINEERING TECHNIQUES IN INSECT MANAGEMENT

3.1 CRISPR-Cas9 and Genome Editing

CRISPR-Cas9 (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) is a revolutionary tool for genome editing that allows for precise modifications of an organism's DNA. The mechanism involves using a guide RNA (gRNA) to direct the Cas9 enzyme to a specific sequence in the genome, where the enzyme creates a double-strand break. This break can then be repaired by the cell's natural repair mechanisms, allowing for the insertion, deletion, or alteration of DNA sequences (Chatterjee & Walker 2017). This technology's precision and efficiency have made it highly valuable for insect management, as it enables scientists to edit genes with unprecedented accuracy, targeting specific traits in pests while minimizing off-target effects. One of the most promising applications of CRISPR technology is in controlling populations of mosquitoes that transmit diseases like malaria, dengue, and Zika. For example, researchers have used CRISPR to modify the *Anopheles gambiae* mosquito, a primary vector of malaria, to reduce its fertility by disrupting genes important for female reproduction. In another study, CRISPR was used to engineer *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes that were resistant to the dengue virus, effectively reducing the ability of these mosquitoes to transmit the disease. These applications have the potential to drastically reduce the prevalence of vector-borne diseases, which affect millions of people each year.

3.2 RNA Interference (RNAi)

RNA interference (RNAi) is a biological process in which double-stranded RNA molecules inhibit gene expression by degrading messenger RNA (mRNA) molecules, thus preventing protein synthesis. This gene silencing mechanism can be used to target specific genes in pests, effectively reducing their viability or reproductive capabilities (Kola et al. 2015). RNAi-based pest control involves designing small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) that target essential genes in pest species, leading to their death or reduced fitness. RNAi has been applied to control various agricultural pests, such as the Colorado potato beetle (*Leptinotarsa decemlineata*) and the western corn rootworm (*Diabroticavirgifera virgifera*), which cause significant crop damage. RNAi-based sprays have been developed to target essential genes in these pests, leading to substantial reductions in pest populations. RNAi has been used to control mosquitoes by targeting genes involved in vector competence, thereby reducing their ability to transmit diseases like malaria (Blair & Olson 2015). Despite its potential, the widespread use of RNAi in pest control faces several challenges, primarily related to the effective delivery of RNA molecules to target pests. Factors such as degradation by environmental conditions, low uptake efficiency, and variability in response among different insect species have limited the practical application of RNAi. Researchers are exploring novel delivery methods, such as nanoparticles and viral vectors, to enhance the stability and uptake of RNAi molecules in target insects.

3.3 Gene Drives

Gene drives are genetic systems that increase the likelihood of a specific gene being inherited by offspring, thereby spreading the modified gene throughout a population more rapidly than

Table 2. Genetic engineering techniques in insect management

Genetic Engineering Technique	Description	Applications	Advantages	Challenges
Sterile Insect Technique (SIT)	Releases genetically modified sterile insects to suppress pest populations.	Used in controlling fruit flies, mosquitoes, and tsetse flies.	Environmentally friendly, species-specific, no chemical residues.	High production cost, requires continuous release, limited scalability.
RNA Interference (RNAi)	Silences specific genes essential for pest survival or reproduction.	RNAi sprays targeting gene functions in pests like Colorado potato beetle.	Precise and species-specific, environmentally safe, minimizes resistance risk.	Stability in field conditions, high cost of RNA molecule production.
Gene Drive Technology	Modifies inheritance patterns to spread genetic traits in pest populations.	Control of malaria-carrying mosquitoes by reducing fertility.	Long-term, self-propagating solution, reduces reliance on pesticides.	Ecological risks, unintended spread, regulatory and ethical concerns.
Transgenic Crops Expressing Bt Toxins	Crops engineered to produce Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) toxins that kill pests.	Bt cotton, Bt maize for lepidopteran and coleopteran pest control.	Reduced pesticide use, increased yield, and cost-effective over time.	Potential resistance in pests, public resistance, and regulatory hurdles.
CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing	Direct editing of pest genomes for desired traits like sterility or lethality.	Targeting Anopheles mosquitoes to curb malaria transmission.	High precision, allows targeted modifications, potential for pest eradication.	High cost, ethical concerns, unintended mutations, and regulatory challenges.
Paratransgenesis	Genetic modification of insect symbionts to disrupt pest reproduction or survival.	Altering gut bacteria of vectors like mosquitoes to block pathogen transmission.	Species-specific, low environmental impact, targets disease vectors.	Complexity in symbiont-host relationships, public acceptance issues.
Antimicrobial Peptide Engineering	Engineering pests to produce antimicrobial peptides that reduce vector competence.	Used in mosquitoes to inhibit malaria parasite development.	Targets disease vectors directly, reduces dependency on pesticides.	Potential off-target effects, regulatory hurdles, and high research costs.
Conditional Lethality Genes	Introducing genes that cause death under specific environmental conditions.	Control of pests like pink bollworm with conditional sterility genes.	Effective population suppression, reduces pesticide applications.	Complex implementation, high monitoring costs, potential resistance.
Host-Induced Gene Silencing (HIGS)	Plants engineered to produce RNAi molecules targeting pest genes.	Wheat and rice engineered for pest protection using HIGS.	Sustainable pest management, minimizes need for external pesticide applications.	Requires careful gene selection, potential off-target effects.
Epigenetic Modifications	Altering pest epigenomes to affect development or reproduction.	Using epigenetic regulators to control mosquito fertility.	Reversible modifications, potential for precision targeting.	Limited understanding of pest epigenomes, complex field application.

(Source: (Chatterjee & Walker 2017, Blair & Olson 2015, Bloss et al. 2017))

would occur through natural inheritance. The CRISPR-based gene drive technology has shown promise in controlling insect populations by biasing inheritance patterns to reduce pest numbers or alter their traits (Zhao et al., 2024). This approach can be used to control disease vectors or invasive species that threaten biodiversity. One of the most well-known applications of gene drives is in controlling populations of *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes. By inserting a gene drive designed to impair female fertility, researchers have achieved a significant reduction in mosquito populations in laboratory settings. The ultimate goal is to release these genetically modified mosquitoes into the wild to reduce the incidence of malaria, which affects over 200 million people annually. While gene drives hold great promise for controlling pest populations, they also raise significant ethical and ecological concerns. The release of gene drive organisms into the wild is irreversible and could have unintended consequences on ecosystems, including the potential disruption of food webs and non-target species. Regulatory frameworks and extensive risk assessments are needed before gene drives can be deployed on a large scale.

3.4 Transgenic Insects

Transgenic insects are those that have been genetically modified to carry specific traits, such as sterility or resistance to pathogens. The Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) involves releasing large numbers of sterilized male insects into the wild to mate with females, thereby reducing the population over time (Robinson, 2021). Genetic engineering has enhanced SIT by allowing the production of sterilized males that are more competitive in mating, improving the technique's effectiveness. One notable example of using transgenic insects in pest control is the release of genetically modified *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes in Brazil. These mosquitoes were engineered to carry a self-limiting gene that prevents their offspring from surviving to adulthood. Field trials showed an 80% reduction in local mosquito populations, which has the potential to decrease the spread of dengue, Zika, and chikungunya. Similar trials have been conducted in Florida, demonstrating the feasibility of using genetically modified mosquitoes for disease control (Bloss et al., 2017).

3.5 Synthetic Biology Approaches

Synthetic biology involves designing and constructing new biological parts, devices, and systems to create organisms with novel traits. In insect management, synthetic biology can be used to engineer insects with traits that reduce pest populations or disrupt their behavior. For example, researchers are exploring the use of synthetic genetic circuits to control mosquito behavior, such as reducing their attraction to human hosts. Synthetic biology also offers the potential to engineer environments that are resistant to pests. Researchers are developing crops that can produce insect pheromones to disrupt pest mating behaviors or attract natural predators. By leveraging synthetic biology, it may be possible to create ecosystems that are inherently hostile to pest species, reducing the need for chemical pesticides.

4. CASE STUDIES AND REAL-WORLD APPLICATIONS

4.1 Mosquito Control

The application of CRISPR-Cas9 technology to modify mosquito populations has shown great promise in reducing the spread of malaria and dengue (Tajudeen et al., 2023). One of the most notable efforts in this area involves the genetic modification of *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes, which are primary vectors of malaria in sub-Saharan Africa. Researchers have used CRISPR to develop gene drives that spread a genetic mutation reducing female mosquito fertility, which could lead to significant reductions in mosquito populations over time. A laboratory demonstrated that gene drives could effectively reduce populations of *Anopheles gambiae* by 99% in controlled environments. This reduction could potentially curb malaria transmission, which currently affects over 200 million people annually, with approximately 619,000 deaths reported in 2022. For dengue control, the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito has been a primary target for genetic modification. CRISPR-modified mosquitoes have been engineered to be resistant to the dengue virus, thereby reducing the ability of these mosquitoes to transmit the disease to humans. Field trials conducted by researchers in Brazil showed that releasing CRISPR-modified mosquitoes led to a 70% decrease in the local population of *Aedes aegypti* and a corresponding reduction in dengue incidence (Camporesi & Cavaliere, 2016). These trials highlight the potential for using CRISPR technology in real-world settings to control vector-borne diseases. The Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) is another effective strategy that has been enhanced through genetic engineering.

Traditionally, SIT involves the mass release of irradiated sterile males to mate with wild females, resulting in no offspring and a gradual population decline. Irradiation can reduce the competitiveness of sterile males. To address this, scientists have developed genetically engineered *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes that carry a self-limiting gene, which causes offspring to die before reaching adulthood. This approach was successfully tested in Brazil, where the release of these genetically modified males led to an 80% reduction in *Aedes aegypti* populations in targeted areas (Carvalho et al., 2015). Similar trials in the Florida Keys demonstrated the feasibility of using genetically modified mosquitoes to reduce populations of disease vectors without the use of chemical insecticides.

4.2 Agricultural Pest Management

The Mediterranean fruit fly (*Ceratitis capitata*) is a significant agricultural pest that affects a wide range of fruit crops. Traditional chemical controls have led to resistance and environmental concerns, prompting researchers to explore genetic solutions. One innovative approach involves using CRISPR to develop sterile male Mediterranean fruit flies that are released into the wild to mate with females, leading to a decline in pest populations. In trials conducted in Israel, the release of genetically modified sterile males led to a 60-70% reduction in fruit fly infestations (Hendrichs et al. 1995). Another genetic strategy involves engineering fruit flies to carry sex-distorting genes, which skew the population ratio towards males. This method can significantly reduce breeding success in pest populations, thereby reducing damage to crops. This approach, combined with traditional methods like pheromone traps, provides a comprehensive solution for managing pests in orchards and vineyards. RNA interference (RNAi) has emerged as a powerful tool for controlling agricultural pests without harming beneficial species. By targeting essential genes in pests, RNAi can suppress their ability to feed, reproduce, or survive. One successful application involved the control of the western corn rootworm (*Diabrotica virgifera virgifera*), a major pest of maize in the United States. RNAi sprays targeting specific genes in the rootworm reduced crop damage by 40-50% in field trials. Researchers are exploring RNAi applications to control pests like the Colorado potato beetle and the cotton bollworm, which are resistant to many conventional insecticides (Nitnavare et al., 2021). Despite its promise, RNAi technology faces challenges in delivery and stability. To overcome these hurdles, scientists are developing nanoparticles and other delivery systems that protect RNAi molecules from environmental degradation, ensuring they reach their intended targets more effectively.

4.3 Pollinator Protection

One of the critical concerns with the use of genetic pest control technologies is the potential impact on non-target species, particularly pollinators like bees, which are essential for ecosystem health and food production. To address this, researchers are developing genetic modifications that are highly specific to target pests, reducing the risk of unintended harm. For example, CRISPR and RNAi technologies can be designed to target genes that are unique to pest species, minimizing off-target effects on beneficial insects (Mehlhorn et al., 2021). Scientists are exploring strategies to protect pollinators by engineering crops that are resistant to pests rather than using broad-spectrum insecticides. By reducing the need for chemical pesticides, these genetic solutions can help protect bee populations. Genetically modified crops like Bt cotton and Bt maize are designed to be toxic only to specific pests, leaving pollinators unharmed. Studies have shown that fields planted with Bt crops have higher bee populations compared to those treated with conventional insecticides.

5. ETHICS, ECOLOGY, AND REGULATION

5.1 Ethics

Significant ethical concerns. Gene drives, in particular, have the ability to rapidly spread genetic modifications through wild populations by ensuring that a particular trait is inherited by nearly all offspring, bypassing the standard 50% inheritance rate (Chapman & Burke, 2006). While this technology holds great promise for controlling disease vectors like malaria-carrying mosquitoes, it also carries the risk of unintended consequences if a gene drive escapes into non-target populations or causes unforeseen ecological effects. Once released, gene drives cannot easily be recalled, which raises questions about who gets to decide when and where these technologies should be deployed. The ethical debate extends to the release of genetically modified (GM) insects, such as the *Aedes* *aegypti* mosquitoes engineered to reduce populations in areas affected by dengue and Zika. While these interventions have shown promise in reducing disease incidence, concerns remain about altering the genetic makeup of wild populations and the potential for unknown long-term effects. Critics argue that the release of transgenic organisms could set a precedent for manipulating other species, with implications for biodiversity and natural ecosystems (Kapuscinski, 2002). There are also concerns about consent from communities in areas where releases occur, especially in regions with vulnerable populations. The introduction of genetically modified insects or gene drives could disrupt existing ecosystems in unpredictable ways. For example, reducing the population of mosquitoes may benefit human health but could have cascading effects on species that rely on mosquitoes as a food source, such as birds, bats, and amphibians. Altering one pest species could inadvertently give rise to secondary pests or allow other disease vectors to fill the ecological niche, potentially leading to new public health challenges.

5.2 Ecological Impact

One of the primary ecological concerns associated with genetic pest control is the potential impact on non-target species. The use of gene drives to reduce populations of *Anopheles* mosquitoes could inadvertently affect other mosquito species that are ecologically important (Hammond & Galizi, 2017). Similarly, RNA interference (RNAi) technology, while highly specific, may still have off-target effects if the RNA sequences used are not perfectly matched, potentially affecting non-target organisms that play important roles in ecosystems. Studies have shown that reducing mosquito populations could have unpredictable effects on food webs, particularly in ecosystems where mosquitoes serve as a primary food source during their larval stage. Altering the population dynamics of one species could lead to population booms or declines in other species, potentially destabilizing local ecosystems. The long-term ecological consequences of altering insect populations through genetic engineering are not yet fully understood. Some researchers are concerned that pests could develop resistance to genetic modifications, similar to how they have developed resistance to chemical pesticides (Sharma et al., 2004). This could lead to a cycle where increasingly aggressive genetic modifications are needed, potentially escalating environmental risks. There is also the risk that genetic modifications could spread to related species through hybridization, leading to unintended genetic changes in wild populations.

5.3 Regulation

The regulation of genetically modified insects varies widely across the globe, with no universally accepted framework. In the United States, genetically engineered insects are regulated by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), depending on the specific application. The release of genetically modified mosquitoes by Oxitec in Florida, required approval from the EPA, which reviewed the potential environmental impact before granting permission. In the European Union, regulations are stricter, with a focus on the precautionary principle, requiring extensive risk assessments before the release of genetically modified organisms (Guida, 2021). Regulatory frameworks are often fragmented and inconsistent, leading to challenges in the approval and monitoring of transgenic insect releases, particularly in developing countries where the regulatory infrastructure may be lacking. There is a pressing need for international cooperation to establish standardized guidelines for the use of genetic technologies, especially given the potential for gene drives to spread across national borders. One of the biggest challenges in regulating genetically modified insects is gaining public trust. Public acceptance is important, as large-scale releases of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) may affect communities directly. Studies have shown that public perceptions of GMOs are often influenced by misinformation, leading to resistance against their use. Efforts to engage stakeholders, including local communities, scientists, policymakers, and non-governmental organizations, are essential to building consensus on the use of genetic technologies for pest control (Hasan et al., 2018). The lack of clear international regulatory guidelines makes it difficult to address cross-border ecological impacts. For example, a gene drive released in one country could spread to neighboring countries, raising concerns about sovereignty and the potential need for international agreements to govern such releases.

6. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

6.1 Technical Challenges

One of the foremost technical challenges in using genetic engineering for pest control is ensuring that genetic modifications are precise and do not have unintended effects. Technologies like CRISPR-Cas9allow for highly targeted edits; off-target mutations can occur, which may lead to unintended changes in the genome of the modified organism. These off-target effects could potentially disrupt non-target genes, leading to unforeseen ecological impacts if genetically modified insects are released into the environment. An off-target mutation in a mosquito might affect genes related to its behavior or lifecycle, potentially altering its ecological role (Xu, 2023). Another challenge is the stability of these genetic modifications over multiple generations. Genetic changes need to be stably inherited to achieve long-term pest control. Natural selection may favor wild-type alleles that restore the original genetic function, thereby reducing the effectiveness of engineered traits over time. This is particularly a concern with gene drives, which are designed to spread modifications rapidly through populations but may be countered by genetic resistance. RNA interference (RNAi) has shown great promise for pest control by silencing essential genes in pests. Delivering RNAi molecules to target insects effectively remains a significant hurdle. RNA molecules are prone to degradation by environmental factors such as UV light, rain, and soil microbes, which limits their efficacy in field conditions (Bachman et al., 2020). Ensuring that RNAi is taken up by the target pest without affecting non-target species is another major challenge, particularly for pests that have developed barriers to RNA uptake. Advances in nanoparticle-based delivery systems are being explored to enhance stability and target specificity, but these technologies are still in the experimental stages and require further development before they can be widely applied.

6.2 Resistance Development

A significant concern with the use of genetic control methods, similar to the issue faced with chemical pesticides, is the potential for target pests to develop resistance. Just as pests have evolved resistance to nearly every class of insecticides, they could also adapt to genetic modifications. There have been reports of resistance developing in populations exposed to genetically modified Bt crops, such as the pink bollworm (*Pectinophora gossypiella*) in India (Naik et al., 2018). With gene drives, there is a risk that mutations could arise in the targeted sequences, rendering the gene drive ineffective. Laboratory studies have already shown that mosquito populations can develop resistance to gene drives after a few generations due to naturally occurring mutations that prevent the gene drive from functioning properly. This highlights the need for strategies to mitigate resistance, such as incorporating redundant targeting sites or developing “daisy chain” gene drives that are designed to degrade over time.

6.3 Economic and Practical Barriers

The development of genetically engineered insects is a resource-intensive process that requires significant investment in research, regulatory approvals, and infrastructure. The cost of developing, testing, and scaling up genetic technologies can be prohibitive, particularly for smaller companies and developing countries. For example, the field trials conducted by Oxitec for genetically modified *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes in Brazil and Florida required extensive safety assessments, which can cost millions of dollars (Bennett, 2018). This creates a financial barrier for widespread adoption, particularly in regions that lack the resources to invest in advanced biotechnological solutions. The costs of maintaining genetically modified insect populations, ensuring biosafety measures, and monitoring ecological impacts post-release can be high. For example, deploying gene drive mosquitoes for malaria control would require ongoing monitoring to track the spread and effectiveness of the modified genes, as well as potential ecological side effects. The need for continual investment to maintain the infrastructure and regulatory oversight can strain budgets, especially in countries where malaria is endemic but resources are limited. While genetic engineering offers promising solutions for pest control, scaling these technologies to different regions poses several challenges (Carroll et al., 2014). Factors such as local environmental conditions, the diversity of pest species, and the presence of related non-target species need to be carefully considered. Genetically modified mosquitoes that are effective in one ecological zone may not be as successful in another due to differences in mosquito behavior, climate, or disease dynamics. The regulatory landscape varies significantly between countries, with some regions having stringent controls on the release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) while others have more permissive policies. The European Union, for example, has a highly precautionary approach, making it challenging to conduct field trials for genetically modified insects. In contrast, countries like Brazil and the United States have been more open to testing and deploying genetic technologies for mosquito control (Schairer, 2021). This regulatory inconsistency can hinder international collaboration and the transfer of genetic pest control technologies to areas where they are most needed.

7. FUTURE

7.1 Advancements in Gene Editing Technologies

Although CRISPR-Cas9 has revolutionized the field of genetic engineering, there are still challenges related to its accuracy and potential off-target effects. Future research is focused on developing more precise versions of CRISPR to minimize unintended gene modifications. Recent advancements like prime editing and base editing aim to improve precision by allowing single nucleotide changes without causing double-strand breaks. Prime editing, in particular, has been shown to make accurate edits with reduced off-target mutations compared to standard CRISPR-Cas9 techniques (Ochoa-Sanchez et al., 2021). In CRISPR, RNA interference (RNAi) technologies are being refined to increase their effectiveness in pest control. Current challenges include ensuring the stability and uptake of RNAi molecules in field conditions. To address these issues, researchers are developing nanoparticle-based delivery systems that protect RNAi molecules from environmental degradation while enhancing their absorption by target pests. By improving delivery methods, RNAi could become a more robust tool for controlling pests like the Colorado potato beetle and the western corn rootworm, which are resistant to conventional insecticides. Gene drives have enormous potential for controlling pest populations by biasing inheritance patterns. The risk of resistance developing or unintended ecological consequences necessitates further refinement. Researchers are working on “daisy chain” gene drives, which are designed to self-limit and degrade over a set number of generations, reducing the risk of permanent ecological disruption (Ginsberg, 2018). These next-generation gene drives could provide more control over the spread of genetic modifications, allowing for safer implementation in real-world environments. Another promising area of research involves CRISPR-Cas12a, which is more efficient than the traditional Cas9 system in certain applications due to its ability to target multiple genes simultaneously. By integrating these advancements, scientists aim to develop gene drives that are more controllable and have a reduced risk of resistance. This is particularly important for managing disease vectors like *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes, which are responsible for transmitting malaria to over 200 million people annually (Kogan & Kogan 2020).

7.2 Integrated Pest Management Strategies

To maximize the effectiveness and sustainability of pest control, researchers are exploring Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategies that combine genetic engineering with traditional control methods. By using genetic technologies in conjunction with biological controls, chemical pesticides, and cultural practices, it is possible to reduce pest populations more sustainably while minimizing environmental impacts. For example, genetically engineered mosquitoes could be used in combination with the Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) and habitat modification to control populations of *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes, which transmit dengue and Zika. The combination of RNAi-based sprays with conventional pest management practices has shown promise in controlling resistant pests like the fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) and the cotton bollworm (*Helicoverpa armigera*) (Hanamasagar et al., 2024). By reducing reliance on chemical insecticides, these integrated approaches can help slow the development of resistance and decrease the environmental footprint of agriculture.

7.3 Potential for Eco-Friendly and Sustainable Pest Control Solutions

Genetic engineering offers a pathway to developing eco-friendly pest control solutions that reduce the use of harmful chemicals. Crops engineered to express *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) toxins have already reduced the need for chemical insecticides by 50-90% in some regions. The next step is to expand the use of genetic technologies to non-crop pests, thereby protecting natural ecosystems and reducing biodiversity loss caused by pesticide overuse. Researchers are also exploring the use of synthetic biology to engineer crops that can repel pests or attract natural predators. This approach could lead to the development of crops that are more resilient to pest pressures while reducing the need for external inputs (Heeb et al., 2019). Such innovations align with the growing emphasis on sustainable agriculture and the need to reduce the environmental impact of food production systems.

7.4 Collaboration and Public Engagement

Addressing the challenges associated with genetic pest control requires interdisciplinary collaboration among scientists, policymakers, and stakeholders. Global cooperation is important, especially given that pests and diseases do not respect national borders. Organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO) and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) play a critical role in facilitating the exchange of knowledge and resources between countries. Joint initiatives, such as the release of genetically modified mosquitoes in Brazil and the Florida Keys, demonstrate the benefits of international collaboration in tackling global health challenges (Bennett, 2018). Interdisciplinary research efforts are also essential to advance the development of safe and effective genetic technologies. By bringing together experts in genetics, ecology, bioethics, and social sciences, researchers can address the complex challenges associated with deploying genetic engineering in pest management. This collaborative approach is critical for ensuring that new technologies are both scientifically sound and socially acceptable. Public acceptance is a significant barrier to the deployment of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), especially in agriculture and pest control. Misinformation and public skepticism have hindered the adoption of genetically engineered crops and insects in many regions (Stone, 2002). To address this, researchers and policymakers must engage with the public through transparent communication, emphasizing the safety, benefits, and potential risks of genetic technologies. One successful strategy has been community engagement programs, such as those implemented in Africa for the release of gene drive mosquitoes aimed at reducing malaria transmission. By involving local communities in the decision-making process and providing clear information about the scientific basis for interventions, researchers can build trust and foster support for genetic pest control initiatives. Educational campaigns and collaborations with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can help raise awareness about the potential benefits of genetic technologies, promoting informed public dialogue (Srivastav et al., 2024).

8. CONCLUSION

Genetic engineering holds immense promise for revolutionizing pest management, offering more sustainable, precise, and eco-friendly alternatives to traditional methods. Technologies like CRISPR, RNAi, and gene drives have demonstrated potential in reducing agricultural damage and controlling disease vectors, but challenges such as off-target effects, resistance development, and public skepticism remain. Integrating genetic approaches into broader Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategies can enhance their effectiveness while minimizing environmental impact. Successful implementation requires interdisciplinary collaboration, robust regulatory frameworks, and public engagement to address ethical and ecological concerns. By fostering global cooperation and increasing transparency, the scientific community can build public trust and ensure these technologies are used safely and responsibly. Continued research and innovation will be key to realizing the full potential of genetic tools in securing food systems and public health for the future.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

Bachman, P., Fischer, J., Song, Z., Urbanczyk-Wochniak, E., & Watson, G. (2020). Environmental fate and dissipation of applied dsRNA in soil, aquatic systems, and plants. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *11*, 21.

Bennett, P. A. (2018). *The globally manufactured mosquito: Creating a public health technology in key west, florida* (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton).

Bennett, P. A. (2018). *The globally manufactured mosquito: Creating a public health technology in key west, florida* (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton).

Blair, C. D., & Olson, K. E. (2015). The role of RNA interference (RNAi) in arbovirus-vector interactions. *Viruses*, *7*(2), 820-843.

Bloss, C. S., Stoler, J., Brouwer, K. C., Bietz, M., & Cheung, C. (2017). Public response to a proposed field trial of genetically engineered mosquitoes in the United States. *Jama*, *318*(7), 662-664.

Burt, A., Coulibaly, M., Crisanti, A., Diabate, A., & Kayondo, J. K. (2018). Gene drive to reduce malaria transmission in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, *5*(sup1), S66-S80.

Camporesi, S., & Cavaliere, G. (2016). Emerging ethical perspectives in the clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats genome-editing debate. *Personalized medicine*, *13*(6), 575-586.

Carroll, S. P., Jørgensen, P. S., Kinnison, M. T., Bergstrom, C. T., Denison, R. F., Gluckman, P., ... & Tabashnik, B. E. (2014). Applying evolutionary biology to address global challenges. *science*, *346*(6207), 1245993.

Carvalho, D. O., McKemey, A. R., Garziera, L., Lacroix, R., Donnelly, C. A., Alphey, L., ... & Capurro, M. L. (2015). Suppression of a field population of Aedes aegypti in Brazil by sustained release of transgenic male mosquitoes. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*, *9*(7), e0003864.

Carvalho, D. O., McKemey, A. R., Garziera, L., Lacroix, R., Donnelly, C. A., Alphey, L., ... & Capurro, M. L. (2015). Suppression of a field population of Aedes aegypti in Brazil by sustained release of transgenic male mosquitoes. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*, *9*(7), e0003864.

Chapman, M. A., & Burke, J. M. (2006). Letting the gene out of the bottle: the population genetics of genetically modified crops. *New Phytologist*, *170*(3), 429-443.

Chatterjee, N., & Walker, G. C. (2017). Mechanisms of DNA damage, repair, and mutagenesis. *Environmental and molecular mutagenesis*, *58*(5), 235-263.

Deininger, K., & Byerlee, D. (2012). The rise of large farms in land abundant countries: do they have a future?. *World development*, *40*(4), 701-714.

Devos, Y., Mumford, J. D., Bonsall, M. B., Camargo, A. M., Firbank, L. G., Glandorf, D. C., ... & Wimmer, E. A. (2022). Potential use of gene drive modified insects against disease vectors, agricultural pests and invasive species poses new challenges for risk assessment. *Critical Reviews in Biotechnology*, *42*(2), 254-270.

Ginsberg, A. D. (2018). *Better: navigating imaginaries in design and synthetic biology to question'better'*. Royal College of Art (United Kingdom).

Goettel, M. S., & Hajek, A. E. (2001). Evaluation of non-target effects of pathogens used for management of arthropods. In *Evaluating indirect ecological effects of biological control. Key papers from the symposium'Indirect ecological effects in biological control', Montpellier, France, 17-20 October 1999* (pp. 81-97). Wallingford UK: CABI Publishing.

Guida, A. (2021). The precautionary principle and genetically modified organisms: A bone of contention between European institutions and member states. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, *8*(1), lsab012.

Hammond, A. M., & Galizi, R. (2017). Gene drives to fight malaria: current state and future directions. *Pathogens and global health*, *111*(8), 412-423.

Hanamasagar, Y., Ramesha, N. M., Mahapatra, S., Panigrahi, C. K., Vidhya, C. S., Agnihotri, N., & Satapathy, S. N. (2024). Advancing RNAi for Sustainable Insect Management: Targeted Solutions for Eco-friendly Pest Control. *Journal of Experimental Agriculture International*, *46*(6), 740-775.

Harrison, H. L., Mitchell, J. W., Loucks, O. L., Parkhurst, D. F., Tracy, C., Watts, D. G., & Yannacone Jr, V. J. (1970). Systems Studies of DDT Transport: A systems analysis provides new insights for predicting long-term impacts of DDT in ecosystems. *Science*, *170*(3957), 503-508.

Harvey-Samuel, T., Xu, X., Lovett, E., Dafa'alla, T., Walker, A., Norman, V. C., ... & Alphey, L. (2021). Engineered expression of the invertebrate-specific scorpion toxin AaHIT reduces adult longevity and female fecundity in the diamondback moth Plutella xylostella. *Pest Management Science*, *77*(7), 3154-3164.

Hasan, M. A., Nahiduzzaman, K. M., & Aldosary, A. S. (2018). Public participation in EIA: A comparative study of the projects run by government and non-governmental organizations. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *72*, 12-24.

Heeb, L., Jenner, E., & Cock, M. J. (2019). Climate-smart pest management: building resilience of farms and landscapes to changing pest threats. *Journal of pest science*, *92*(3), 951-969.

Hendrichs, J., Franz, G., & Rendon, P. (1995). Increased effectiveness and applicability of the sterile insect technique through male-only releases for control of Mediterranean fruit flies during fruiting seasons. *Journal of Applied Entomology*, *119*(1-5), 371-377.

Kapuscinski, A. R. (2002). *Controversies in designing useful ecological assessments of genetically engineered organisms*. New York: CRC Press.

Kogan, F., & Kogan, F. (2020). Malaria burden. *Remote Sensing for Malaria: Monitoring and Predicting Malaria from Operational Satellites*, 15-41.

Kola, V. S. R., Renuka, P., Madhav, M. S., & Mangrauthia, S. K. (2015). Key enzymes and proteins of crop insects as candidate for RNAi based gene silencing. *Frontiers in physiology*, *6*, 119.

Kotsakiozi, P., Gloria-Soria, A., Caccone, A., Evans, B., Schama, R., Martins, A. J., & Powell, J. R. (2017). Tracking the return of Aedes aegypti to Brazil, the major vector of the dengue, chikungunya and Zika viruses. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*, *11*(7), e0005653.

Krishna, V. V., & Qaim, M. (2012). Bt cotton and sustainability of pesticide reductions in India. *Agricultural Systems*, *107*, 47-55.

Lamichhane, J. R., Dachbrodt-Saaydeh, S., Kudsk, P., & Messéan, A. (2016). Toward a reduced reliance on conventional pesticides in European agriculture. *Plant Disease*, *100*(1), 10-24.

Mehlhorn, S., Hunnekuhl, V. S., Geibel, S., Nauen, R., & Bucher, G. (2021). Establishing RNAi for basic research and pest control and identification of the most efficient target genes for pest control: a brief guide. *Frontiers in Zoology*, *18*, 1-16.

Mlambo, S., Mubayiwa, M., Tarusikirwa, V. L., Machekano, H., Mvumi, B. M., & Nyamukondiwa, C. (2024). The fall armyworm and larger grain borer Pest invasions in Africa: drivers, impacts and implications for food systems. *Biology*, *13*(3), 160.

Naik, V. C., Kumbhare, S., Kranthi, S., Satija, U., & Kranthi, K. R. (2018). Field-evolved resistance of pink bollworm, Pectinophora gossypiella (Saunders)(Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae), to transgenic Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) cotton expressing crystal 1Ac (Cry1Ac) and Cry2Ab in India. *Pest Management Science*, *74*(11), 2544-2554.

Nitnavare, R. B., Bhattacharya, J., Singh, S., Kour, A., Hawkesford, M. J., & Arora, N. (2021). Next generation dsRNA-based insect control: Success so far and challenges. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *12*, 673576.

Ochoa-Sanchez, A., Perez-Sanchez, G., Torres-Ledesma, A. M., Valdez, J. P. R., Rinaldi, G., Moguel, B. B., & Molina-Aguilar, C. (2021). Prime Editing, a novel genome-editing tool that may surpass conventional CRISPR-Cas9. *Re: GEN Open*, *1*(1), 75-82.

Robinson, A. S. (2021). Genetic basis of the sterile insect technique. In *Sterile insect technique* (pp. 143-162). CRC Press.

Sanchis, V. (2011). From microbial sprays to insect-resistant transgenic plants: history of the biospesticide Bacillus thuringiensis. A review. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, *31*, 217-231.

Savary, S., Horgan, F., Willocquet, L., & Heong, K. L. (2012). A review of principles for sustainable pest management in rice. *Crop protection*, *32*, 54-63.

Schairer, C. E., Najera, J., James, A. A., Akbari, O. S., & Bloss, C. S. (2021). Oxitec and MosquitoMate in the United States: lessons for the future of gene drive mosquito control. *Pathogens and global health*, *115*(6), 365-376.

Shad, S. A., Sayyed, A. H., Fazal, S., Saleem, M. A., Zaka, S. M., & Ali, M. (2012). Field evolved resistance to carbamates, organophosphates, pyrethroids, and new chemistry insecticides in Spodoptera litura Fab.(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Journal of Pest Science*, *85*, 153-162.

Sharma, H. C., Sharma, K. K., & Crouch, J. H. (2004). Genetic transformation of crops for insect resistance: potential and limitations. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, *23*(1), 47-72.

Srivastav, A. K., Das, P., & Srivastava, A. K. (2024). Future Trends, Innovations, and Global Collaboration. In *Biotech and IoT: An Introduction Using Cloud-Driven Labs* (pp. 309-398). Berkeley, CA: Apress.

Stone, G. D. (2002). Both sides now: Fallacies in the genetic-modification wars, implications for developing countries, and anthropological perspectives. *Current Anthropology*, *43*(4), 611-630.

Tajudeen, Y. A., Oladipo, H. J., Oladunjoye, I. O., Oladipo, M. K., Shittu, H. D., Abdulmumeen, I. F., ... & El-Sherbini, M. S. (2023). Transforming malaria prevention and control: the prospects and challenges of gene drive technology for mosquito management. *Annals of Medicine*, *55*(2), 2302504.

Ward, N. (1994). *Farming on the treadmill: agricultural change and pesticide pollution*. University of London, University College London (United Kingdom).

Xu, M. (2023). The Method and Prospects of Changing Mosquito Genes with CRISPR-Cas9. *Journal of Mosquito Research*, *13*.

Zhao, Y., Li, L., Wei, L., Wang, Y., & Han, Z. (2024). Advancements and Future Prospects of CRISPR-Cas-Based Population Replacement Strategies in Insect Pest Management. *Insects*, *15*(9), 653.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/127741