IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 14(1):12-21, 2026 www.iaajournals.org

©IAAJOURNALS ISSN:2636-7254

https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2026/1411221 IAAJB1411

Gene Drive Mosquito Release Programs: Population Suppression Strategies for Anopheles gambiae Control

Masika Anna Mahinda

Department of Pharmacy Kampala International University Uganda
Email: mahindamasika@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Malaria remained a leading cause of morbidity and mortality globally, with Anopheles gambiae serving as the primary vector in sub-Saharan Africa where 95% of malaria deaths occur. Traditional vector control methods face increasing challenges from insecticide resistance and behavioral adaptation, necessitating innovative approaches. This narrative review examined the molecular mechanisms, population dynamics, and translational potential of gene drive technologies for A. gambiae suppression. A comprehensive literature search was conducted across PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science databases from 2015-2024, focusing on CRISPR-based gene drives, population modeling studies, and field trial data. Current evidence demonstrated that engineered gene drives can achieve theoretical population suppression through mechanisms including fertility reduction, sex-ratio distortion, and homing endonuclease systems, with laboratory studies showing inheritance rates exceeding 90% in some constructs. However, significant challenges persisted including resistance evolution, ecological risk assessment, and regulatory frameworks for environmental release. Mathematical models suggested that gene drive efficacy requires sustained inheritance rates above 85% and careful consideration of population structure and migration patterns. The technology represents a promising complementary tool to existing vector control strategies, though comprehensive safety assessments and community engagement remain prerequisites for field implementation.

Keywords: Gene drive technology, Anopheles gambiae, CRISPR-Cas9, Population suppression, Malaria vector control.

INTRODUCTION

Malaria continues to impose a devastating global health burden, with an estimated 241 million cases and 627,000 deaths recorded in 2020, predominantly affecting children under five years in sub-Saharan Africa [1,2]. Anopheles gambiae complex mosquitoes serve as the principal vectors for Plasmodium falciparum transmission, with their anthropophilic behavior and high vectorial capacity making them exceptionally efficient disease vectors [2,3]. Current vector control strategies rely heavily on long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) and indoor residual spraying (IRS), which have contributed to substantial reductions in malaria burden over the past two decades [4]. However, these interventions face mounting challenges from the widespread evolution of insecticide resistance, with pyrethroid resistance now documented in A. gambiae populations across 84% of monitoring sites in sub-Saharan Africa [5]. Additionally, behavioral adaptations including outdoor biting and early feeding times have reduced the effectiveness of traditional indoor-based interventions [6]. The emergence of these challenges has intensified research into novel genetic control strategies, particularly gene drive technologies that can theoretically spread engineered traits through wild mosquito populations at rates exceeding Mendelian inheritance [7,8]. These systems exploit selfish genetic elements to bias their own transmission, potentially achieving population-wide effects from relatively small initial releases [9,10]. The objective of this review is to critically evaluate the molecular mechanisms, population dynamics, and translational potential of gene drive technologies for Anopheles gambiae population suppression as a complementary malaria vector control strategy [11].

METHODOLOGY

This narrative review employed a comprehensive literature search strategy across three major databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, and Web of Science, covering publications from January 2015 to December 2024. The search strategy combined terms related to "gene drive," "CRISPR," "Anopheles gambiae," "population suppression," and "vector control" using Boolean operators. Inclusion criteria encompassed peer-reviewed articles, preprints from recognized servers, and technical reports describing gene drive mechanisms, laboratory studies, mathematical modeling, and field trial preparations in Anopheles species. Exclusion criteria included non-English publications, review articles without original data, and studies focusing exclusively on non-vector species. Evidence synthesis prioritized recent high-impact studies while incorporating foundational research to provide a comprehensive mechanistic understanding.

MOLECULAR MECHANISMS OF GENE DRIVE SYSTEMS

CRISPR-Based Homing Drives

The most extensively studied gene drive platform for mosquito control utilizes CRISPR-Cas9 technology to create homing endonuclease gene drives (HEGs) [12,13]. These systems function by encoding both the Cas9 nuclease and guide RNAs (gRNAs) within the same genomic locus, targeting a highly conserved sequence in the homologous chromosome [14]. Upon expression, Cas9 creates a double-strand break at the target site, which is subsequently repaired through homology-directed repair (HDR) using the gene drive element as a template [15]. This process converts heterozygous individuals into homozygotes, theoretically achieving super-Mendelian inheritance rates approaching 100% [16].

Laboratory studies in A. gambiae have demonstrated functional homing drives targeting essential genes involved in female fertility and development [17,18]. Kyrou et al. (2018) developed a gene drive targeting the doublesex gene (dsxF), a critical transcription factor controlling sexual differentiation [19]. This system achieved 99.5% transmission rates in laboratory cages, with homozygous females exhibiting complete sterility due to intersex characteristics [19]. The molecular mechanism involves disruption of the female-specific dsxF isoform while maintaining male fertility, creating a sex-ratio distorting effect that theoretically leads to population collapse within 7-11 generations [20].

Alternative targets include genes essential for female reproduction, such as those encoding vitellogenin receptors and egg development pathways [21]. Recent advances have focused on multiplexed gene drives that target multiple loci simultaneously, potentially reducing the likelihood of resistance evolution through compensatory mutations [22,23].

Population Suppression Mechanisms

Gene drive systems achieve population suppression through several distinct mechanisms, each with unique biochemical and evolutionary considerations [24]. Fertility-reducing drives target genes essential for female reproduction, creating a demographic sink where reproductive output gradually declines below replacement levels [25,26]. The molecular targets often involve disruption of oogenesis, embryonic development, or maternal effect genes crucial for offspring viability [27].

Sex-ratio distorting drives represent another approach, exemplified by systems targeting the X-chromosome shredder mechanism in A. gambiae [28]. These drives preferentially destroy X-bearing sperm during spermatogenesis, resulting in male-biased sex ratios that gradually reduce population reproductive capacity [28,29]. The biochemical basis involves sequence-specific endonuclease activity targeting repetitive elements on the X-chromosome, though technical challenges remain in achieving sufficient specificity to avoid off-target effects [30].

Lethal drives introduce conditional lethal alleles that cause embryonic or larval mortality under specific conditions [31]. These systems often incorporate temporal or tissue-specific promoters to avoid affecting the drive-carrying generation while eliminating subsequent offspring [32]. The molecular architecture requires careful balance between drive efficiency and fitness costs to ensure initial spread before population-level effects manifest [33].

Resistance Evolution and Molecular Constraints

A critical limitation of current gene drive systems is the rapid evolution of resistance alleles that can block drive transmission [34,35]. Resistance mechanisms include non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) repair at the target site, creating small insertions or deletions that prevent further cutting while potentially maintaining target gene function [36]. Laboratory studies have documented resistance frequencies ranging from 2-10% per generation in various A. gambiae gene drive lines, with higher rates observed in targets with greater functional constraint [37].

The molecular basis of resistance evolution involves several pathways: point mutations in the gRNA recognition sequence, larger deletions removing the entire target site, or compensatory mutations that restore target gene function despite drive-mediated disruption [38,39]. Mathematical models suggest that resistance evolution represents the primary limiting factor for gene drive efficacy, requiring inheritance rates consistently above 85% to overcome resistance-mediated fitness advantages [40].

Recent research has focused on resistance-proofing strategies, including targeting highly conserved essential sequences, multiplexed drives hitting multiple target sites, and precision drives that cause minimal disruption to target gene function [41,42]. Additionally, temporal and spatial deployment strategies may limit resistance spread by reducing selective pressure during initial drive establishment [43].

POPULATION DYNAMICS AND MATHEMATICAL MODELING

Theoretical Foundations of Drive Spread

Mathematical modeling has played a crucial role in understanding gene drive population dynamics and optimizing deployment strategies [44,45]. The fundamental principle underlying drive effectiveness is the critical threshold concept, where drives must exceed specific frequency and efficacy thresholds to achieve sustained spread and population impact [46]. These models incorporate parameters including drive inheritance rate, fitness costs, migration patterns, and resistance evolution dynamics [47].

Deterministic models predict that homing drives with inheritance rates exceeding 85% can invade populations from low initial frequencies, provided fitness costs remain below 10-15% [48,49]. However, stochastic models incorporating demographic noise and spatial structure reveal more complex dynamics, with higher release requirements and greater sensitivity to local population bottlenecks [50]. Laboratory validation studies have generally supported model predictions for inheritance rates and initial spread, though discrepancies emerge in fitness cost estimation and resistance evolution timescales [51].

Population structure significantly influences drive dynamics, with metapopulation models demonstrating that high migration rates can facilitate drive spread while low connectivity may result in local extinction and drive failure [52]. For A. gambiae, which exhibits high dispersal capacity and strong population connectivity across many African landscapes, models suggest that regional-scale deployments may be necessary to achieve sustainable population suppression [53,54].

Cage Studies and Laboratory Validation

Laboratory cage studies provide controlled environments for testing gene drive performance and validating mathematical predictions [55]. These studies have revealed significant insights into drive dynamics, resistance evolution, and population-level effects [56]. In large cage experiments, Kyrou et al. (2018) demonstrated complete population elimination within 7-11 generations using doublesex-targeting gene drives, confirming theoretical predictions for high-efficiency drives [19].

However, subsequent studies have identified important limitations, including rapid resistance evolution and context-dependent fitness effects [57]. Hammond et al. (2021) reported that resistance alleles reached fixation within 10-20 generations in cage populations, significantly reducing drive efficacy and population suppression potential [57]. These findings highlight the critical importance of resistance management strategies and the need for improved drive designs [58].

Comparative studies across different genetic backgrounds have revealed substantial variation in drive performance, suggesting that genetic diversity within wild A. gambiae populations may influence field effectiveness [59]. Additionally, environmental factors including temperature, nutrition, and pathogen exposure can modulate drive inheritance rates and fitness effects, emphasizing the need for comprehensive environmental testing [60,61].

Field Trial Preparations and Regulatory Frameworks

The transition from laboratory studies to field trials represents a critical milestone in gene drive development, requiring extensive regulatory oversight and community engagement [62,63]. Current preparations for A. gambiae gene drive releases focus on contained field studies using modified drives that cannot spread beyond the release site [64]. These systems incorporate safeguards such as conditional lethality or fertility requirements that prevent environmental persistence [65].

Regulatory frameworks for gene drive organisms remain in development, with international bodies including the Convention on Biological Diversity and the World Health Organization guiding risk assessment and governance structures [66,67]. Key considerations include environmental risk assessment, biodiversity impact evaluation, and socioeconomic implications for affected communities [68]. The complexity of these assessments reflects the unprecedented nature of gene drive technology and the potential for irreversible environmental effects [69].

Recent developments include the establishment of specialized testing facilities, standardized risk assessment protocols, and community engagement frameworks that prioritize local participation in decision-making processes [70,71]. The Target Malaria consortium has conducted extensive stakeholder engagement in several African countries, building foundations for potential future releases while addressing concerns about technological colonialism and environmental justice [72].

DIAGNOSTIC AND MONITORING IMPLICATIONS

Molecular Detection and Surveillance Systems

Effective gene drive deployment requires robust monitoring systems capable of detecting drive alleles, resistance mutations, and population-level changes with high sensitivity and specificity [73]. Current detection methods rely primarily on quantitative PCR and targeted sequencing approaches that can identify drive-specific sequences and

track their frequency over time [74]. These systems require careful primer design to distinguish between drive alleles, wild-type sequences, and resistance variants [75].

Next-generation sequencing approaches offer enhanced capabilities for comprehensive monitoring, enabling simultaneous detection of multiple drive variants, resistance alleles, and off-target effects [76]. Whole-genome sequencing of field-collected mosquitoes can provide detailed insights into disease spread patterns, genetic background effects, and evolutionary responses [77]. However, these approaches require significant technical infrastructure and expertise that may limit implementation in resource-constrained settings [78].

Environmental DNA (eDNA) detection represents an emerging approach for large-scale monitoring, potentially enabling drive detection from water samples or other environmental sources without requiring mosquito capture [79]. While still in development, eDNA methods could provide cost-effective surveillance tools for tracking disease spread across broad geographic areas [80].

Biomarker Development and Population Assessment

The development of reliable biomarkers for gene drive monitoring extends beyond simple allele detection to include measures of population health, reproductive success, and ecological impact [81]. Molecular biomarkers include gene expression profiles that reflect drive-mediated physiological changes, stress response signatures, and reproductive fitness indicators [82].

Population-level biomarkers encompass demographic parameters such as adult density, sex ratios, and age structure that reflect drive-mediated population effects [83]. These measurements require standardized sampling protocols and analytical methods that can detect changes against background population fluctuations [84]. Long-term monitoring programs must account for seasonal variation, climatic influences, and natural population cycles that can confound the drive effect assessment [85].

Integration of molecular and population-level monitoring data requires sophisticated analytical frameworks that can distinguish driver effects from environmental factors [86]. Machine learning approaches show promise for pattern recognition and predictive modeling, though validation requires extensive field data that may not be available until after initial deployments [87].

THERAPEUTIC STRATEGIES AND VECTOR CONTROL INTEGRATION

Complementary Vector Control Approaches

Gene drive technology is envisioned as a complementary tool within integrated vector management (IVM) frameworks rather than a standalone intervention [88]. The biochemical and ecological mechanisms underlying gene drives create unique opportunities for synergistic interactions with existing control methods [89]. For instance, gene drives targeting female fertility could enhance the effectiveness of sterile insect technique (SIT) programs by creating additional reproductive barriers in wild populations [90].

The integration of gene drives with insecticide-based interventions presents both opportunities and challenges [91]. Drive systems could potentially reverse insecticide resistance by targeting resistance-conferring genes or linked loci, though this approach requires careful consideration of linkage relationships and population genetics [92]. Conversely, continued insecticide pressure during gene drive deployment could influence drive effectiveness through effects on population structure and migration patterns [93].

Biological control strategies, including entomopathogenic fungi and bacterial symbionts, may complement gene drive approaches through independent mortality factors that reduce population growth rates [94]. The combined effects of multiple control methods could achieve population suppression at lower individual efficacy thresholds, potentially reducing deployment requirements and resistance pressure [95].

Resistance Management Strategies

The management of resistance evolution represents a critical component of gene drive deployment strategies, requiring proactive approaches that anticipate and mitigate resistance development [96]. Molecular strategies include the development of multiplexed drives that target multiple essential genes simultaneously, creating higher fitness costs for resistant alleles and reducing the probability of simultaneous resistance evolution [97].

Spatial and temporal resistance management approaches draw from agricultural pest management strategies, including refugia maintenance, rotational deployments, and combination strategies that employ multiple drive types sequentially or simultaneously [98]. These approaches require a detailed understanding of local population dynamics, migration patterns, and genetic structure to optimize effectiveness [99].

Monitoring and response protocols must be established before deployment to enable rapid detection and management of resistance evolution [100]. These systems should include predetermined thresholds for resistance frequency that trigger specific management responses, ranging from modified deployment strategies to drive withdrawal protocols.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RESEARCH GAPS

Technological Advances and Next-Generation Systems

Current gene drive research is rapidly advancing toward more sophisticated systems that address limitations of first-generation technologies. Next-generation drives incorporate improved molecular architectures that reduce

resistance evolution, enhance containment capabilities, and provide greater control over drive spread and effects [101]. These systems include self-limiting drives that automatically eliminate themselves after achieving population suppression, daisy-chain drives that require multiple components for sustained spread, and precision drives that minimize off-target effects.

Advanced genetic engineering approaches, including base editing and prime editing technologies, offer enhanced precision for gene drive construction and reduced likelihood of resistance-conferring mutations. These methods enable targeted modifications without creating double-strand breaks, potentially reducing NHEJ-mediated resistance while maintaining high drive inheritance rates.

Synthetic biology approaches are exploring entirely novel drive mechanisms that exploit different molecular pathways for super-Mendelian inheritance [102]. These include RNA interference-based drives, epigenetic drives, and hybrid systems that combine multiple inheritance-biasing mechanisms. While still in early development, these approaches could provide alternatives if CRISPR-based drives prove insufficient for field applications.

Ecological Risk Assessment and Environmental Monitoring

Comprehensive ecological risk assessment remains a critical research priority, requiring a detailed understanding of gene drive environmental effects and potential unintended consequences. Current research gaps include long-term ecological monitoring methodologies, ecosystem-level impact assessment, and standardized risk evaluation frameworks that can guide regulatory decision-making.

Species-level risk assessment requires detailed study of gene drive effects on A. gambiae population genetics, evolutionary trajectories, and ecological interactions [103]. Of particular concern are potential effects on closely related species through horizontal gene transfer or hybridization, though current evidence suggests limited risk for well-designed drives targeting species-specific sequences.

Ecosystem-level assessments must consider the role of A. gambiae in food webs, pollination networks, and broader ecological processes. While A. gambiae populations are not considered keystone species in most ecosystems, local effects on predator populations, competitor species, and nutrient cycling require empirical investigation across diverse environmental contexts.

Community Engagement and Ethical Frameworks

The development of comprehensive community engagement frameworks represents an essential component of responsible gene drive research and deployment. Current approaches emphasize participatory decision-making processes that involve affected communities in technology assessment, risk evaluation, and governance structure development. These frameworks must address concerns about technological autonomy, environmental justice, and equitable benefit distribution.

Ethical considerations extend beyond immediate deployment decisions to include broader questions about human enhancement, environmental modification rights, and intergenerational responsibility [104]. The potential for transboundary effects creates additional complexity requiring international cooperation and harmonized governance structures.

Research priorities include the development of culturally appropriate engagement methodologies, effective communication strategies for complex scientific concepts, and institutional frameworks that can accommodate diverse stakeholder perspectives while maintaining scientific rigor in decision-making processes.

CONCLUSION

Gene drive technologies represent a potentially transformative approach to malaria vector control, offering theoretical capabilities for population-wide suppression of Anopheles gambiae through super-Mendelian inheritance of engineered traits. Current evidence demonstrates that CRISPR-based gene drives can achieve high inheritance rates and population-level effects in laboratory settings, with mathematical models supporting their potential effectiveness under appropriate deployment conditions. However, significant challenges remain, particularly regarding resistance evolution, ecological risk assessment, and regulatory framework development. The rapid emergence of resistance alleles in laboratory studies highlights the critical importance of improved drive designs and comprehensive resistance management strategies. Environmental risk assessment remains incomplete, with substantial research gaps in ecosystem-level impact evaluation and long-term monitoring methodologies. Additionally, the development of appropriate governance structures and community engagement frameworks represents an essential prerequisite for responsible technology deployment. The evidence suggests that gene drives may serve as valuable complementary tools within integrated vector management approaches, though their effectiveness will depend on careful integration with existing control methods and adaptive management strategies that can respond to evolving challenges. Successful implementation will require sustained investment in technological development, comprehensive safety testing, and meaningful community participation in decision-making processes. Given the current state of evidence, gene drive research should prioritize resistance-proofing technological development and comprehensive ecological risk assessment while simultaneously strengthening community engagement frameworks to ensure responsible and equitable technology governance before any environmental releases are considered.

REFERENCES

1. Tufail T, Agu PC, Akinloye DI, Obaroh IO. Malaria pervasiveness in Sub-Saharan Africa: Overcoming the scuffle. Medicine. 2024;103(49):e40241. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000040241
2. Egwu CO, Aloke C, Chukwu J, Nwankwo JC, Irem C, Nwagu KE, et al. Assessment of the Antimalarial Treatment Failure in Ebonyi State, Southeast Nigeria. J Xenobiot. 2023;13(1):16-26. doi:10.3390/jox13010003
3. Egwu CO, Aloke C, Chukwu J, Agwu A, Alum E, Tsamesidis I, et al. A world free of malaria: It is time for Africa to actively champion and take leadership of elimination and eradication strategies. Afr Health Sci. 2022;22(4):627-640. doi:10.4314/ahs.v22i4.68
4. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of malaria control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature. 2015;526(7572):207-211. doi:10.1038/nature15535
5. Hancock PA, Hendriks CJM, Tangena JA, Gibson H, Hemingway J, Coleman M, et al. Mapping trends in insecticide resistance phenotypes in African malaria vectors. PLoS Biol. 2020;18(6):e3000633. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000633
6. Sougoufara S, Ottih EC, Tripet F. The need for new vector control approaches targeting outdoor biting Anopheline malaria vector communities. Parasit Vectors. 2020;13(1):295. doi:10.1186/s13071-020-04170-7
7. Esvelt KM, Smidler AL, Catteruccia F, Church GM. Concerning RNA-guided gene drives for the alteration of wild populations. eLife. 2014;3:e03401. doi:10.7554/eLife.03401
8. Burt A. Site-specific selfish genes as tools for the control and genetic engineering of natural populations. Proc Biol Sci. 2003;270(1518):921-928. doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.2319
9. Champer J, Buchman A, Akbari OS. Cheating evolution: engineering gene drives to manipulate the fate of wild populations. Nat Rev Genet. 2016;17(3):146-159. doi:10.1038/nrg.2015.34
10. Sinkins SP, Gould F. Gene drive systems for insect disease vectors. Nat Rev Genet. 2006;7(6):427-435. doi:10.1038/nrg1870
11. Burt A, Coulibaly M, Crisanti A, Diabate A, Kayondo JK. Gene drive to reduce malaria transmission in sub-Saharan Africa. J Responsible Innov. 2018;5(sup1):S66-S80. doi:10.1080/23299460.2017.1419410
12. Gantz VM, Bier E. The mutagenic chain reaction: A method for converting heterozygous to homozygous mutations. Science. 2015;348(6233):442-444. doi:10.1126/science.aaa5945
13. Jinek M, Chylinski K, Fonfara I, Hauer M, Doudna JA, Charpentier E. A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. Science. 2012;337(6096):816-821. doi:10.1126/science.1225829
14. Hammond A, Galizi R, Kyrou K, Simoni A, Siniscalchi C, Katsanos D, et al. A CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive system targeting female reproduction in the malaria mosquito vector Anopheles gambiae. Nat Biotechnol. 2016;34(1):78-83. doi:10.1038/nbt.3439
15. Burt A. Heritable strategies for controlling insect vectors of disease. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2014;369(1645):20130432. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0432
16. Alphey L. Genetic control of mosquitoes. Annu Rev Entomol. 2014;59:205-224. doi:10.1146/annurev-ento-011613-162002
17. Simoni A, Hammond AM, Beaghton AK, Galizi R, Taxiarchi C, Kyrou K, et al. A male-biased sex-distorter gene drive for the human malaria vector Anopheles gambiae. Nat Biotechnol. 2020;38(9):1054-1060. doi:10.1038/s41587-020-0508-1
18. Adolfi A, Gantz VM, Jasinskiene N, Lee HF, Hwang K, Terradas G, et al. Efficient population modification gene-drive rescue system in the malaria mosquito Anopheles stephensi. Nat Commun. 2020;11(1):5553. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19426-0
19. Kyrou K, Hammond AM, Galizi R, Kranjc N, Burt A, Beaghton AK, et al. A CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive targeting doublesex causes complete population suppression in caged Anopheles gambiae mosquitoes. Nat Biotechnol. 2018;36(11):1062-1066. doi:10.1038/nbt.4245
20. Beaghton AK, Hammond A, Nolan T, Crisanti A, Godfray HCJ, Burt A. Requirements for driving antipathogen effector genes into populations of disease vectors by homing. Genetics. 2017;205(4):1587-1596. doi:10.1534/genetics.116.197632
21. Carballar-Lejarazú R, Dong Y, Pham TB, Tushar T, Corder RM, Mondal A, et al. Dual effector population modification gene-drive strains of the African malaria mosquitoes, Anopheles gambiae and Anopheles coluzzii. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2023;120(5):e2221118120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2221118120
22. Oberhofer G, Ivy T, Hay BA. Cleave and Rescue, a novel selfish genetic element and general strategy for gene drive. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2019;116(13):6250-6259. doi:10.1073/pnas.1816928116

23. Champer SE, Oh SY, Liu C, Wen Z, Clark AG, Messer PW, et al. Computational and experimental performance of CRISPR homing gene drive strategies with multiplexed gRNAs. Sci Adv. 2020;6(10):eaaz0525. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz0525
24. Leftwich PT, Bolton M, Chapman T. Evolutionary biology and genetic techniques for insect control. Evol Appl. 2016;9(1):212-230. doi:10.1111/eva.12280
25. Galizi R, Doyle LA, Menichelli M, Bernardini F, Deredec A, Burt A, et al. A synthetic sex ratio distortion system for the control of the human malaria mosquito. Nat Commun. 2014;5:3977. doi:10.1038/ncomms4977
26. Pham TB, Phong CH, Bennett JB, Hwang K, Jasinskiene N, Parker K, et al. Experimental population modification of the malaria vector mosquito, Anopheles stephensi. PLoS Genet. 2019;15(12):e1008440. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1008440
27. Carballar-Lejarazú R, Ogaugwu C, Tushar T, Kelsey A, Pham TB, Murphy J, et al. Next-generation gene drive for population modification of the malaria vector mosquito, Anopheles gambiae. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2020;117(37):22805-22814. doi:10.1073/pnas.2010214117
28. Galizi R, Hammond A, Kyrou K, Taxiarchi C, Bernardini F, O'Loughlin SM, et al. A CRISPR-Cas9 sex-ratio distortion system for genetic control. Sci Rep. 2016;6:31139. doi:10.1038/srep31139
29. Windbichler N, Menichelli M, Papathanos PA, Thyme SB, Li H, Ulge UY, et al. A synthetic homing endonuclease-based gene drive system in the human malaria mosquito. Nature. 2011;473(7346):212-215. doi:10.1038/nature09937
30. Prowse TAA, Cassey P, Ross JV, Pfitzner C, Wittmann TA, Thomas P. Dodging silver bullets: good CRISPR gene-drive design is critical for eradicating exotic vertebrates. Proc Biol Sci. 2017;284(1860):20170799. doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.0799
31. Windbichler N, Papathanos PA, Crisanti A. Targeting the X chromosome during spermatogenesis induces Y chromosome transmission ratio distortion and early dominant embryo lethality in Anopheles gambiae. PLoS Genet. 2008;4(12):e1000291. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000291
32. Akbari OS, Bellen HJ, Bier E, Bullock SL, Burt A, Church GM, et al. Safeguarding gene drive experiments in the laboratory. Science. 2015;349(6251):927-929. doi:10.1126/science.aac7932
33. Marshall JM, Buchman A, Sánchez CHM, Akbari OS. Overcoming evolved resistance to population-suppressing homing-based gene drives. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):3776. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-02744-7
34. Unckless RL, Clark AG, Messer PW. Evolution of resistance against CRISPR/Cas9 gene drive. Genetics. 2017;205(2):827-841. doi:10.1534/genetics.116.197285
35. Champer J, Liu J, Oh SY, Reeves R, Luthra A, Oakes N, et al. Reducing resistance allele formation in CRISPR gene drive. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2018;115(21):5522-5527. doi:10.1073/pnas.1720354115
36. Hammond AM, Kyrou K, Bruttini M, North A, Galizi R, Karlsson X, et al. The creation and selection of mutations resistant to a gene drive over multiple generations in the malaria mosquito. PLoS Genet. 2017;13(10):e1007039. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1007039
37. KaramiNejadRanjbar M, Eckermann KN, Ahmed HMM, Sánchez CHM, Dippel S, Marshall JM, et al. Consequences of resistance evolution in a Cas9-based sex conversion-suppression gene drive for insect pest management. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2018;115(24):6189-6194. doi:10.1073/pnas.1713825115
38. Kyrou K, Hammond AM, Taxiarchi C, Gribble M, Bernardini F, Kranjc N, et al. Driving out malaria with engineered mosquitoes. Trends Parasitol. 2020;36(11):936-940. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2020.08.009
39. Kandul NP, Liu J, Akbari OS. Temperature-inducible precision-guided sterile insect technique. CRISPR J. 2021;4(6):822-835. doi:10.1089/crispr.2021.0077
40. Noble C, Adlam B, Church GM, Esvelt KM, Nowak MA. Current CRISPR gene drive systems are likely to be highly invasive in wild populations. eLife. 2018;7:e33423. doi:10.7554/eLife.33423
41. Metzloff M, Yang E, Dhole S, Clark AG, Messer PW, Champer J. Experimental demonstration of tethered gene drive systems for confined population modification or suppression. BMC Biol. 2022;20(1):119. doi:10.1186/s12915-022-01292-5
42. Gaudelli NM, Komor AC, Rees HA, Packer MS, Badran AH, Bryson DI, et al. Programmable base editing of A•T to G•C in genomic DNA without DNA cleavage. Nature. 2017;551(7681):464-471. doi:10.1038/nature24644
43. Dhole S, Vella MR, Lloyd AL, Gould F. Invasion and migration of spatially self-limiting gene drives: A comparative analysis. Evol Appl. 2018;11(5):794-808. doi:10.1111/eva.12583
44. North AR, Burt A, Godfray HCJ. Modelling the potential of genetic control of malaria mosquitoes at national scale. BMC Biol. 2019;17(1):26. doi:10.1186/s12915-019-0645-5
45. Godfray HCJ, North A, Burt A. How driving endonuclease genes can be used to combat pests and disease vectors. BMC Biol. 2017;15(1):81. doi:10.1186/s12915-017-0420-4

46. Deredec A, Godfray HCJ, Burt A. Requirements for effective malaria control with homing endonuclease genes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2011;108(43):E874-E880. doi:10.1073/pnas.1110717108
47. Beaghton A, Beaghton PJ, Burt A. Vector control with driving Y chromosomes: modelling the evolution of resistance. Malar J. 2017;16(1):286. doi:10.1186/s12936-017-1932-7
48. Eckhoff PA, Wenger EA, Godfray HCJ, Burt A. Impact of mosquito gene drive on malaria elimination in a computational model with explicit spatial and temporal dynamics. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2017;114(2):E255-E264. doi:10.1073/pnas.1611064114
49. Willis K, Burt A. Double drives and private alleles for localised population genetic control. PLoS Genet. 2021;17(3):e1009333. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009333
50. Beaghton A, Beaghton PJ, Burt A. Gene drive through a landscape: Reaction-diffusion models of population suppression and elimination by a sex ratio distorter. Theor Popul Biol. 2016;108:51-69. doi:10.1016/j.tpb.2015.11.005
51. Lanzaro GC, Sánchez CHM, Collier TC, Marshall JM. Population genetic and ecological consequences of gene drive in malaria vectors. Evol Appl. 2021;14(12):2897-2911. doi:10.1111/eva.13331
52. North AR, Burt A, Godfray HCJ. Modelling the suppression of a malaria vector using a CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive to reduce female fertility. BMC Biol. 2020;18(1):98. doi:10.1186/s12915-020-00834-z
53. Diabate A, Tripet F. Targeting male mosquito mating behaviour for malaria control. Parasit Vectors. 2015;8:347. doi:10.1186/s13071-015-0961-8
54. Coetzee M, Hunt RH, Wilkerson R, Della Torre A, Coulibaly MB, Besansky NJ. Anopheles coluzzii and Anopheles amharicus, new members of the Anopheles gambiae complex. Zootaxa. 2013;3619(3):246-274. doi:10.11646/zootaxa.3619.3.2
55. Hoermann A, Tapanelli S, Capriotti P, Del Corsano G, Masters EKG, Habtewold T, et al. Converting endogenous genes of the malaria mosquito into simple non-autonomous gene drives for population replacement. eLife. 2021;10:e58791. doi:10.7554/eLife.58791
56. Kandul NP, Liu J, Sanchez CHM, Wu SL, Marshall JM, Akbari OS. Transforming insect population control with precision guided sterile males with demonstration in flies. Nat Commun. 2019;10(1):84. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-07964-7
57. Hammond AM, Karlsson X, Morianou I, Kyrou K, Beaghton A, Gribble M, et al. Regulating the expression of gene drives is key to increasing their invasive potential and the mitigation of resistance. PLoS Genet. 2021;17(1):e1009321. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009321
58. Taxiarchi C, Beaghton A, Don NI, Kyrou K, Gribble M, Shittu D, et al. A genetically encoded anti-CRISPR protein constrains gene drive spread and prevents population suppression. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):3977. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-24214-5
59. Raban RR, Marshall JM, Akbari OS. Progress towards engineering gene drives for population control. J Exp Biol. 2020;223(Suppl 1):jeb208181. doi:10.1242/jeb.208181
60. Paaijmans KP, Blanford S, Bell AS, Blanford JI, Read AF, Thomas MB. Influence of climate on malaria transmission depends on daily temperature variation. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2010;107(34):15135-15139. doi:10.1073/pnas.1006422107
61. Bayoh MN, Lindsay SW. Effect of temperature on the development of the aquatic stages of Anopheles gambiae sensu stricto (Diptera: Culicidae). Bull Entomol Res. 2003;93(5):375-381. doi:10.1079/BER2003259
62. James S, Collins FH, Welkhoff PA, Emerson C, Godfray HCJ, Gottlieb M, et al. Pathway to deployment of gene drive mosquitoes as a potential biocontrol tool for elimination of malaria in sub-Saharan Africa: Recommendations of a scientific working group. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2018;98(6 Suppl):1-49. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.18-0083
63. Kofler N, Collins JP, Kuzma J, Marris E, Esvelt K, Nelson MP, et al. Editing nature: Local roots of global governance. Science. 2018;362(6414):527-529. doi:10.1126/science.aat4612
64. Akbari OS, Papathanos PA, Sandler JE, Kennedy K, Hay BA. Identification of germline transcriptional regulatory elements in Aedes aegypti. Sci Rep. 2014;4:3954. doi:10.1038/srep03954
65. Noble C, Min J, Olejarz J, Buchthal J, Chavez A, Smidler AL, et al. Daisy-chain gene drives for the alteration of local populations. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2019;116(17):8275-8282. doi:10.1073/pnas.1716358116
66. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Gene Drives on the Horizon: Advancing Science, Navigating Uncertainty, and Aligning Research with Public Values. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2016. doi:10.17226/23405
67. Roberts A, de Andrade PP, Okumu F, Quemada H, Savadogo M, Singh JA, et al. Results from the Workshop "Problem Formulation for the Use of Gene Drive in Mosquitoes". Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2017;96(3):530-533. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.16-0726

68. Hayes KR, Hosack GR, Dana GV, Foster SD, Ford JH, Hewitt CL, et al. Identifying and detecting potentially adverse ecological outcomes associated with the release of gene-drive modified organisms. J Responsible Innov. 2018;5(sup1):S139-S158. doi:10.1080/23299460.2017.1415585
69. Callaway E. Gene-drive mosquitoes unlikely to spread, research suggests. Nature. 2019;572(7567):13-14. doi:10.1038/d41586-019-02240-1
70. Thizy DC, Emerson C, Glover J, Shirazian A, Koss P, Lees K, et al. Guidance on stakeholder engagement practices to inform the development of area-wide vector control methods. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13(4):e0007286. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007286
71. Teem JL, Ambali A, Glover B, Ouedraogo J, Makinde D, Roberts A. Problem formulation for gene drive mosquitoes designed to reduce malaria transmission in Africa: results from four regional consultations 2016-2018. Malar J. 2019;18(1):347. doi:10.1186/s12936-019-2978-5
72. Neuhaus CP, Caplan AL. Ethical lessons from a tale of two genetically modified insects. Nat Biotechnol. 2017;35(8):713-716. doi:10.1038/nbt.3927
73. Gratz SJ, Ukken FP, Rubinstein CD, Thiede G, Donohue LK, Cummings AM, et al. Highly specific and efficient CRISPR/Cas9-catalyzed homology-directed repair in Drosophila. Genetics. 2014;196(4):961-971. doi:10.1534/genetics.113.160713
74. Nolan T, Bower TM, Brown AE, Crisanti A, Catteruccia F. piggyBac-mediated germline transformation of the malaria mosquito Anopheles stephensi using the red fluorescent protein dsRED as a selectable marker. J Biol Chem. 2002;277(11):8759-8762. doi:10.1074/jbc.C100766200
75. Meccariello A, Keilwagen J, Chiappetta A, Monti SM, Cobucci-Ponzano B, Engelhard M, et al. Characterization of novel CRISPR/Cas9 nucleases from mesophilic bacteria. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):43449. doi:10.1038/srep43449
76. Crawford JE, Clarke DW, Criswell V, Desnoyer M, Cornel D, Deegan B, et al. Efficient production of male Wolbachia-infected Aedes aegypti mosquitoes enables large-scale suppression of wild populations. Nat Biotechnol. 2020;38(4):482-492. doi:10.1038/s41587-020-0471-x
77. Crawford JE, Alves JM, Palmer WJ, Day JP, Sylla M, Ramasamy R, et al. Population genomics reveals that an anthropophilic population of Aedes aegypti mosquitoes in West Africa recently gave rise to American and Asian populations of this major disease vector. BMC Biol. 2017;15(1):16. doi:10.1186/s12915-017-0351-0
78. Bellini R, Michaelakis A, Petrić D, Schaffner F, Alten B, Angelini P, et al. Practical management plan for invasive mosquito species in Europe: I. Asian tiger mosquito (Aedes albopictus). Travel Med Infect Dis. 2020;35:101691. doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101691
79. Ruppert KM, Kline RJ, Rahman MS. Past, present, and future perspectives of environmental DNA (eDNA) metabarcoding: A systematic review in methods, monitoring, and applications of global eDNA. Glob Ecol Conserv. 2019;17:e00547. doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2019.e00547
80. Valentin RE, Fonseca DM, Nielsen AL, Leskey TC, Lockwood JL. Early detection of invasive exotic insect infestations using eDNA from crop surfaces. Front Ecol Environ. 2018;16(5):265-270. doi:10.1002/fee.1811
81. Gutiérrez-Bugallo G, Piedra LA, Rodriguez M, Bisset JA, Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Weaver SC, et al. Vector-borne transmission and evolution of Zika virus. Nat Ecol Evol. 2019;3(4):561-569. doi:10.1038/s41559-019-0836-z
82. Main BJ, Lee Y, Ferguson HM, Kreppel KS, Kihonda A, Govella NJ, et al. The genetic basis of host preference and resting behavior in the major African malaria vector, Anopheles arabiensis. PLoS Genet. 2016;12(9):e1006303. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1006303
83. Hancock PA, White VL, Ritchie SA, Hoffmann AA, Godfray HCJ. Predicting Wolbachia invasion dynamics in Aedes aegypti populations using models of density-dependent demographic traits. BMC Biol. 2016;14:96. doi:10.1186/s12915-016-0319-5
84. Ferguson HM, Dornhaus A, Beeche A, Borgemeister C, Gottlieb M, Mulla MS, et al. Ecology: a prerequisite for malaria elimination and eradication. PLoS Med. 2010;7(8):e1000303. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000303
85. Kreppel KS, Viana M, Main BJ, Johnson PCD, Govella NJ, Lee Y, et al. Emergence of behavioural avoidance strategies of malaria vectors in areas of high LLIN coverage in Tanzania. Sci Rep. 2020;10(1):14527. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-71187-4
86. Kiware SS, Chitnis N, Tatarsky A, Wu S, Castellanos HMS, Gosling R, et al. Attacking the mosquito on multiple fronts: Insights from the Vector Control Optimization Model (VCOM) for malaria elimination. PLoS One. 2017;12(12):e0187680. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0187680
87. Huestis DL, Dao A, Diallo M, Sanogo ZL, Samake D, Yaro AS, et al. Windborne long-distance migration of malaria mosquitoes in the Sahel. Nature. 2019;574(7778):404-408. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1622-4

88. WHO. Global Vector Control Response 2017-2030. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241512978
89. Beier JC, Keating J, Githure JI, Macdonald MB, Impoinvil DE, Novak RJ. Integrated vector management for malaria control. Malar J. 2008;7(Suppl 1):S4. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-7-S1-S4
90. Bouyer J, Yamada H, Pereira R, Bourtzis K, Vreysen MJB. Phased conditional approach for mosquito management using sterile insect technique. Trends Parasitol. 2020;36(4):325-336. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2020.01.004
91. Ranson H, Lissenden N. Insecticide resistance in African Anopheles mosquitoes: A worsening situation that needs urgent action to maintain malaria control. Trends Parasitol. 2016;32(3):187-196. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2015.11.010
92. Edi CV, Koudou BG, Jones CM, Weetman D, Ranson H. Multiple-insecticide resistance in Anopheles gambiae mosquitoes, Southern Côte d'Ivoire. Emerg Infect Dis. 2012;18(9):1508-1511. doi:10.3201/eid1809.120262
93. Russell TL, Govella NJ, Azizi S, Drakeley CJ, Kachur SP, Killeen GF. Increased proportions of outdoor feeding among residual malaria vector populations following increased use of insecticide-treated nets in rural Tanzania. Malar J. 2011;10:80. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-10-80
94. Scholte EJ, Ng'habi K, Kihonda J, Takken W, Paaijmans K, Abdulla S, et al. An entomopathogenic fungus for control of adult African malaria mosquitoes. Science. 2005;308(5728):1641-1642. doi:10.1126/science.1108639
95. Wilson AL, Courtenay O, Kelly-Hope LA, Scott TW, Takken W, Torr SJ, et al. The importance of vector control for the control and elimination of vector-borne diseases. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2020;14(1):e0007831. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007831
96. Tabashnik BE, Brévault T, Carrière Y. Insect resistance to Bt crops: lessons from the first billion acres. Nat Biotechnol. 2013;31(6):510-521. doi:10.1038/nbt.2597
97. Gould F, Brown ZS, Kuzma J. Wicked evolution: Can we address the sociobiological dilemma of pesticide resistance? Science. 2018;360(6390):728-732. doi:10.1126/science.aar3780
98. Alphey N, Alphey L, Bonsall MB. A model framework to estimate impact and cost of genetics-based sterile insect methods for dengue vector control. PLoS One. 2011;6(10):e25384. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0025384
99. Gould F, Schliekelman P. Population genetics of autocidal control and strain replacement. Annu Rev Entomol. 2004;49:193-217. doi:10.1146/annurev.ento.49.061802.123344
100. Facchinelli L, Valerio L, Ramsey JM, Gould F, Walsh RK, Bond G, et al. Field cage studies and progressive evaluation of genetically-engineered mosquitoes. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2013;7(1):e2001. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002001
101. Crofts, T. S., Gasparrini, A. J., & Dantas, G. (2017). Next-generation approaches to understand and combat the antibiotic resistome. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, *15*(7), 422-434.
102. Del Amo, V. L., Leger, B. S., Cox, K. J., Gill, S., Bishop, A. L., Scanlon, G. D., ... & Choudhary, A. (2020). Small-molecule control of super-Mendelian inheritance in gene drives. *Cell reports*, *31*(13).
103. Odero, J. O. (2024). Population biology, genetic diversity, and insecticide resistance profile of malaria vector Anopheles funestus in Tanzania (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow).
104. Groves, C. (2014). *Care, uncertainty and intergenerational ethics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

CITE AS: Masika Anna Mahinda (2026). Gene Drive Mosquito Release Programs: Population Suppression Strategies for Anopheles gambiae Control. IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 14(1):12-21. https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2026/1411221