www.idosr.org

©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS

Kabazzi, 2025

ISSN: 2550-7931

International Digital Organization for Scientific Research
IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 10(2):73-76, 2025.
https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2025/102.7376

IDOSRJAS1020000

CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Drive Systems for Malaria Vector Control: Progress and Implementation Challenges

Kabazzi Douglas T.

Department of Pharmaceutics Kampala International University Uganda
Email: t.kabazzi@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Malaria remains a leading public health threat, with more than 249 million cases and over 600,000 deaths reported globally in 2022, primarily in sub-Saharan Africa. Traditional vector control tools such as insecticide-treated nets and indoor residual spraying have reduced transmission but are increasingly undermined by insecticide resistance and ecological shifts. CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive technology has emerged as a transformative approach to target mosquito vectors at the population level. The purpose of this review is to examine recent advances in CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive systems for malaria vector control, highlighting biological mechanisms, experimental progress, and implementation challenges. This review synthesized peer-reviewed studies from PubMed, Web of Science, and Scopus, focusing on molecular design, laboratory and semi-field studies, and ecological as well as ethical evaluations of gene drives. Evidence indicated that homing-based drives targeting fertility genes in *Anopheles gambiae* can achieve greater than 95% inheritance bias and drive population suppression within 10–15 generations in laboratory cages. Population modification drives encoding antimalarial effectors demonstrate transmission-blocking efficacy with up to 98% reduction in *Plasmodium falciparum* sporozoite prevalence. However, resistance allele formation, ecological unpredictability, and governance gaps remain substantial barriers. While gene drives hold promises as cost-effective, sustainable tools complementing current interventions, their translation requires robust regulatory frameworks, community engagement, and careful integration with broader malaria elimination strategies. This review concludes that CRISPR-Cas9 gene drives represent both scientific opportunity and policy challenge, necessitating multidisciplinary collaboration to ensure responsible deployment.

Keywords: CRISPR-Cas9, Gene drive, Malaria, Anopheles gambiae, Vector control

INTRODUCTION

Malaria continues to impose a profound health and economic burden worldwide, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. The World Health Organization (WHO) reported 249 million malaria cases and 608,000 associated deaths in 2022, with *Plasmodium falciparum* responsible for over 90% of cases in Africa [1]. Despite major investments in insecticide-treated bed nets, indoor residual spraying, chemoprevention, and artemisinin-based combination therapy, malaria transmission has plateaued over the past decade [2]. Increasing insecticide resistance in *Anopheles* mosquitoes, parasite resistance to frontline drugs, and environmental factors such as climate variability exacerbate the challenge [3]. For instance, climatic fluctuations influence vector abundance and biting rates, altering transmission dynamics and complicating elimination programs [4].

The persistence of malaria underscores the need for innovative approaches that move beyond individual-level protection to population-level interventions. One of the most promising innovations is the application of CRISPR-Cas9-based gene drive systems, which bias inheritance patterns to spread desired genetic traits through mosquito populations. Unlike conventional transgenic strategies, gene drives can rapidly increase allele frequency, potentially enabling either suppression of vector populations or replacement with mosquitoes incapable of transmitting parasites [5]. This review examines the progress and challenges of CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive systems for malaria vector control. It first outlines the biological principles of CRISPR-based drives, then reviews experimental evidence from laboratory and semi-field trials. The discussion then shifts to ecological risks, resistance mechanisms, ethical and regulatory considerations, and the sociopolitical dimensions of implementation. Finally, it highlights future

research directions and clinical implications. The purpose of this review is to provide biomedical researchers and clinicians with a critical synthesis of current knowledge, situating gene drives within the broader malaria elimination agenda.

CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Drive Technology: Mechanistic Foundations

CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive systems exploit the homing mechanism, where the Cas9 nuclease generates a double-stranded break at a target genomic locus, which is then repaired using the drive-containing chromosome as a template through homology-directed repair. This "homing" event converts heterozygous individuals into homozygotes, biasing inheritance toward near 100% rather than the expected 50% under Mendelian rules [6]. Two main gene drives for malaria vector control include population suppression drives, which reduce vector populations, and population modification drives, which introduce antiparasitic effector genes into mosquito genomes [7].

Both approaches rely on efficient homing, minimized fitness costs, and resistance management. Laboratory studies have demonstrated that drives targeting conserved fertility genes such as *doublesex* in *Anopheles gambiae* can achieve >95% drive inheritance and cause rapid population collapse in caged populations [8]. By contrast, modification drives encoding antimicrobial peptides or antibodies against *Plasmodium* have achieved up to 98% reduction in sporozoite prevalence [9].

Experimental Progress in Gene Drive Research

i. **Laboratory Studies:** Initial proof-of-concept studies showed that CRISPR-Cas9 drives targeting the *kynurenine hydroxylase* and *doublesex* genes in *A. gambiae* achieved inheritance rates of 91–99% [8]. When released into large cage populations, drives targeting *doublesex* induced population collapse within 12 generations, with females carrying nonfunctional alleles displaying complete sterility [10]. Similarly, population modification drives incorporating synthetic effector genes, such as single-chain antibodies against the circumsporozoite protein, reduced *P. falciparum* infection prevalence in mosquitoes by over 90% [11].

ii. **Semi-Field Studies:** Transition from laboratory to semi-field settings is essential to assess ecological robustness. In contained greenhouse-like facilities simulating African environments, *A. gambiae* drives maintained high inheritance (>90%) but also revealed emergence of resistant alleles at rates of 1–2% per generation [12]. These alleles, generated through error-prone non-homologous end joining (NHEJ), can compromise long-term drive efficacy.

Mathematical Modeling

Mathematical models predict that releasing gene drive mosquitoes at a frequency of 1–5% of the target population could drive fixation within 20–30 generations, provided resistance is minimized [13]. However, stochastic models indicate that ecological heterogeneity, mating structure, and migration may delay spread or promote local extinction of the drive [14].

Resistance and Molecular Constraints

Resistance is one of the most significant obstacles to gene drive success. Resistant alleles typically arise when Cas9-induced breaks are repaired through NHEJ rather than homology-directed repair. If these resistant alleles preserve gene function, they can outcompete the drive allele [15]. Strategies to overcome resistance include multiplexed guide RNAs targeting multiple sites within essential genes, or targeting highly conserved sequences where mutations are deleterious [16]. Recent experiments using multiplexed drives reduced functional resistance allele emergence to below 1% per generation [17].

Fitness costs of drive constructs also constrain spread. Cas9 expression may reduce mosquito viability, particularly if promoters are active outside the germline. Advances in germline-specific promoters and optimized gRNA scaffolds have mitigated some of these costs [18].

Ecological and Environmental Considerations

The ecological consequences of gene drive releases remain uncertain. Suppression drives could reduce *Anopheles* populations dramatically, potentially altering predator-prey interactions or allowing other vector species to expand [19]. Population modification drives may exert selective pressure on *Plasmodium* parasites, favoring resistant strains. Climate variability further complicates predictions, as temperature and rainfall shifts alter vector abundance and distribution [4]. For instance, warmer temperatures accelerate *Anopheles* breeding cycles, potentially enhancing drive spread but also enabling migration of non-target species into niches vacated by suppressed populations.

Ethical, Social, and Regulatory Challenges

Beyond biology, implementation faces profound ethical and social questions. Gene drives are designed for self-sustaining spread across national borders, raising concerns about consent, governance, and unintended transboundary effects [20]. Community acceptance is critical; studies in sub-Saharan Africa highlight both enthusiasm for innovative malaria tools and apprehension regarding ecological risks [21].

Regulatory frameworks remain fragmented. While the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety provides guidance for genetically modified organisms, it does not specifically address self-propagating gene drives [22]. The WHO has called for phased testing, with rigorous containment, stepwise ecological trials, and continuous monitoring [23].

Future Directions and Clinical Implications

Clinically, successful implementation could reduce malaria incidence dramatically, lowering hospitalizations and mortality, while also reducing drug resistance pressure by decreasing transmission intensity. However, premature deployment without adequate safeguards risks ecological disruption and loss of public trust. Future research should prioritize:

i. Resistance management through multiplexed designs and targeting of conserved essential genes.
ii. Improved containment trials in large semi-field facilities to assess ecological robustness.
iii. Integration with existing interventions, combining gene drives with insecticide-treated nets or seasonal chemoprevention.
iv. Ethical frameworks and governance that ensure community engagement, transparency, and cross-border cooperation.
v. Clinical relevance, as gene drives could complement vaccine rollouts and therapeutic strategies, potentially reducing malaria transmission intensity and protecting vulnerable populations such as pregnant women and children [24].

CONCLUSION

CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive systems represent a breakthrough innovation with potential to transform malaria vector control. Laboratory and semi-field studies demonstrate that both suppression and modification drives can achieve inheritance bias exceeding 95% and substantially reduce *Plasmodium* transmission. Yet resistance allele formation, ecological uncertainty, and governance challenges pose formidable barriers. Ethical considerations and community acceptance are equally critical, as the transboundary nature of gene drives requires global coordination. If responsibly developed and integrated with existing tools, gene drives could accelerate progress toward malaria elimination and reduce reliance on insecticides and antimalarial drugs. The next decade will determine whether scientific advances, ecological safety, and regulatory innovation converge to enable deployment. Researchers and clinicians should prioritize collaborative field-ready designs coupled with community-driven governance models to ensure safe and effective implementation of gene drive technologies.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. World Malaria Report 2023. Geneva: WHO; 2023. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240081270
2. Egwu, C. O., 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 Dec;22(4):627-640. doi: 10.4314/ahs.v22i4.68.
3. 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.
4. Alum, E.U., Ugwu, O.P.C., Egba, S.I., Uti, D.E., Alum, B.N. (2024). Climate Variability and Malaria Transmission: Unraveling the Complex Relationship. INOSR Scientific Research 11(2):16-22. https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRSR/2024/1.1.21622
5. 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.
6. Gantz, V. M., Bier, E. The dawn of active genetics. BioEssays. 2016;38(1):50-63. doi: 10.1002/bies.201500102.
7. Esvelt, K. M., Smidler, A. L., Catteruccia, F., Church, G. M. Concerning RNA-guided gene drives for the alteration of wild populations. eLife. 2014;3:e03401. doi: 10.7554/eLife.03401.
8. Hammond, A., 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.
9. Isaacs, A. T., Jasinskiene, N., Tretiakov, M., Thiery, I., Zettor, A., Bourgouin, C, et al. Transgenic *Anopheles stephensi* coexpressing single-chain antibodies resist *Plasmodium falciparum* development. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2012;109(28):E1922-E1930. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1207738109.
10. Kyrou, K., Hammond, A. M., Galizi, R., Kranjc, N., Burt, A., Beaghton, A, 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.
11. Carballar-Lejarazú, R., James, A. A. Population modification of *Anopheline* species to control malaria transmission. Pathog Glob Health. 2017;111(8):424-435. doi: 10.1080/20477724.2018.1427192.

12. Pham, T. B., Phong, C. H., Bennett, J. B., 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.
13. North, A. R., Burt, A., Godfray, H. C. The dynamics of gene drive in structured populations. Genetics. 2019;211(3):1143-1156. doi: 10.1534/genetics.118.301836.
14. Beaghton, A., Beaghton, P. J., 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.
15. Noble, C., Min, J., Olejarz, J., Buchthal, J., Chavez, A., Smidler, A. L, 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.
16. Champer, J., Buchman, A., Akbari, O. S. 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.
17. Champer, J., Kim, I. K., Champer, S. E., Clark, A. G., Messer, P. W. Suppression gene drive in *Drosophila melanogaster* through a male-specific sterility system. Sci Adv. 2020;6(10):eaaz0525. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aaz0525.
18. Li, M., Yang, T., Kandul, N. P., Bui, M., Gamez, S., Raban, R, et al. Development of a confinable gene drive system in the human disease vector *Aedes aegypti*. eLife. 2020;9:e51701. doi: 10.7554/eLife.51701.
19. 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.
20. Obeagu, E. I., Alum, E. U. and Ugwu, O. P. C. Hepcidin: The Gatekeeper of Iron in Malaria Resistance NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN MEDICAL SCIENCES. 2023; 4(2):1-8. https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJRMS/2023/10.1.1400
21. Marshall, J. M., Akbari, O. S. Can CRISPR-based gene drive be confined in the wild? A question for molecular and population biology. ACS Chem Biol. 2018;13(2):424-430. doi: 10.1021/acschembio.7b00923.
22. Thizy, D., Emerson, C., Gibbs, J., Hartley, S., Kapiriri, L., Lavery, J, 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.
23. World Health Organization. Guidance framework for testing genetically modified mosquitoes. Geneva: WHO; 2021. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240025236
24. Alonso, P. L., Noor, A. M. The global fight against malaria is at crossroads. Lancet. 2017;390(10112):2532-2534. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)33080-5.

CITE AS: Kabazzi Douglas T. (2025). CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Drive Systems for Malaria Vector Control: Progress and Implementation Challenges. IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 10(2):73-76, 2025. https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2025/102.7376