

OPINION

What Is Stopping the Use of Genetically Modified Insects for Disease Control?

Anusha Panjwani, Anthony Wilson*

The Pirbright Institute, Pirbright, Woking, Surrey, United Kingdom

* anthony.wilson@pirbright.ac.uk



 OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Panjwani A, Wilson A (2016) What Is Stopping the Use of Genetically Modified Insects for Disease Control? *PLoS Pathog* 12(10): e1005830. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1005830

Editor: Carolyn B Coyne, University of Pittsburgh, UNITED STATES

Published: October 6, 2016

Copyright: © 2016 Panjwani, Wilson. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Funding: AP is supported by the United Kingdom's Medical Research Council [grant number MR/K020811/1]. AW is supported by the UK's Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council [grant number BBS/E/1/0002066 and BB/M017567/1]. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing Interests: I have read the journal's policy and have the following conflicts: since March 2015, AW has received funding by BBSRC to develop insect population models which could be used to help improve release strategies for GM insect vectors (grant reference BB/M017567/1). This grant involves regular meetings with scientists at Oxitec Ltd. Neither the funder nor Oxitec Ltd had

Insect-borne pathogens impose a substantial burden on health, the environment, and agricultural production, and rapid outbreaks of such pathogens are becoming more common [e.g., 1,2]. Population control is an important component of strategies to control insect-borne pathogens. However, some technologies such as insecticide use are becoming less effective due to resistance [3], or their use is increasingly restricted due to environmental legislation [e.g., 4].

An emerging technology that could form part of strategies for controlling insect-borne pathogens is to suppress or replace insect populations by releasing genetically modified (GM) insects. Trial releases of GM insects for disease control have now been conducted in the Caribbean [5], Malaysia [6], and Brazil [7], but none have yet proceeded in the European Union (EU). In 2015, the only active European GM insect application (olive fly) was withdrawn two years after submission in response to the cost of additional experiments requested by the regulators [8]. In the same year, the regulatory bodies of Brazil and the United States approved two products that were based on a similar mechanism [9,10]. The EU assessment process has been criticised as slow, expensive, unpredictable, and as deterring innovation and technology transfer in this area [11–13]. A recent United Kingdom parliamentary inquiry into the subject concluded that, although appropriate risk assessment was essential, current EU implementation was preventing this technology from realising its full potential [14].

One reason behind geographical differences in the assessment process is probably that there are no truly global guidelines. The Cartagena Protocol [15] establishes basic principles for assessing the safety of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) intended for deliberate release, but some countries with significant involvement in this area such as the US and Argentina are not signatories, and the framework for testing GM mosquitoes published by the World Health Organization (WHO) is explicitly not intended as guidance [16]. There are therefore significant regional differences in interpretation and implementation. For example, assessment in the EU considers only risks [17,18], whereas in the US, Brazil, and New Zealand, potential benefits are also considered [19,20]. Another difference is whether assessment considers the process by which the product is created. Identical products created by classical mutagenesis or GM would be assessed differently in the EU [21,22] but not Canada [23,24].

Regional differences also reflect public opinion. The history of field releases of sterilised disease vectors and GMOs illustrates the importance of effective dialogue with the public. In the 1970s, public concerns about releases conducted by the WHO Research Unit on Genetic Control of Mosquitoes in New Delhi were a major factor in the project's cancellation [25]. More recently, there have been high-profile anti-GM protests in the UK and Germany [26]. Elsewhere, pro-GM attitudes in Pakistan led to widespread smuggling and planting of GM cotton before its official approval in 2010 [27].

any role in the decision to prepare or submit this manuscript.

Part of the solution could be providing more information to the public. Low public awareness of the New Delhi project is thought to have contributed to opposition [25], and the Cartagena Protocol requires that signatories facilitate public awareness of GMOs and their use [15]. However, despite efforts to inform the local community before trialling GM mosquitoes in Grand Cayman in 2009 [28], there were subsequently complaints that the international research community was not adequately consulted [28,29], highlighting the importance of engaging with all stakeholders and not just beneficiaries. More recently, attempts to inform the public about GM mosquito releases in Brazil did not prevent the spread of conspiracy theories linking them to the emergence of Zika virus [30–32].

It is also important that communication is two-way. The “knowledge deficit” model of science communication is increasingly recognised as outdated [33], partly because public concerns are not always obvious. In the UK, discussion at recent public and parliamentary events on the use of GM insects for disease control organised by the authors [34,35] suggested that concerns were higher where private companies were involved than for public sector research. Elsewhere in Europe, it has been suggested that, although public debate around GMOs often focuses on possible biological risks, actual concerns may be about the economic consequences of their use [26]. If true, this could create a vicious cycle: public mistrust of GM driven by its concentration in the hands of a few companies could encourage policymakers to make the licensing and approval process more restrictive, driving up regulatory costs and excluding small companies [14]. However, the views of the most vocal opponents of GM do not necessarily represent views held at a population level [36,37].

Given the lessons learned so far, we suggest that the following three areas represent the best compromise between proportionate risk assessment and maximising the potential benefits of GM.

Firstly, assessments should regulate product, not process. Currently, the EU regulates by process, meaning that mosquitoes rendered sterile by radiation, genetic modification, or the addition of symbiotic bacteria such as *Wolbachia* [38,39] would be regulated differently and potentially by a different agency. Product-based regulation works effectively in countries such as Canada.

Secondly, assessments should consider the balance of risk and benefit resulting from GM insect release, not risk alone. Currently, the EU only considers risk (as discussed above), preventing applicants from providing information on the benefits of the proposed technology [40]. Risk assessment should consider the risks of inaction (status quo) as well as those of proposed action and realistic alternatives such as insecticides [41].

Finally, the process of assessment needs to be more transparent. This would allow both beneficiaries and stakeholders to take part in better-informed discussions of proposed products and the results of trial studies, encourage consistent assessment by authorities across multiple regions, and make it clear to the public that assessments receive expert scrutiny, building confidence in the process. At the same time, we recognise that requiring full disclosure of methods and data at the time of application would strongly discourage innovation. Possible compromises could be to only release data from successful assessments, to embargo these data for a period after the assessment is approved, and/or to consider some form of market exclusivity for a period in return for such disclosure.

Issues relating to the optimal balance between risk and benefit for the use of GM insects for disease control are not going away. New technologies are making it easier and faster to develop GM insects [42]. Although appropriate risk assessment is necessary for novel technologies, focusing assessment on poorly defined biological risks for which there may be no plausible mechanism discourages small companies and academic organisations from developing transgenic insect technologies. The suggestions above could accelerate risk assessment without

increasing risk and facilitate more intelligent dialogue between proponents and opponents of the technology.

References

1. Bajak A. US assesses virus of the Caribbean. *Nature*. 2014; 512(7513):124–5. PMID: [WOS:000340200700007](#). doi: [10.1038/512124a](#)
2. Gatherer D, Kohl A. Zika virus: a previously slow pandemic spreads rapidly through the Americas. *Journal of General Virology*. 2015. doi: [10.1099/jgv.0.000381](#)
3. Liu N. Insecticide Resistance in Mosquitoes: Impact, Mechanisms, and Research Directions. *Annual Review of Entomology*. 2015; 60(1):537–59. doi: [10.1146/annurev-ento-010814-020828](#) PMID: [25564745](#).
4. Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC, 1107/2009 (2009).
5. Harris AF, Nimmo D, McKemey AR, Kelly N, Scaife S, Donnelly CA, et al. Field performance of engineered male mosquitoes. *Nature Biotechnology*. 2011; 29(11):1034–U109. doi: [10.1038/nbt.2019](#) PMID: [WOS:000296801300026](#).
6. Lacroix R, McKemey AR, Raduan N, Wee LK, Ming WH, Ney TG, et al. Open Field Release of Genetically Engineered Sterile Male *Aedes aegypti* in Malaysia. *PLoS ONE*. 2012; 7(8). doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0042771](#) PMID: [WOS:000308044800011](#).
7. Carvalho DO, McKemey AR, Garziera L, Lacroix R, Donnelly CA, Alphey L, et al. Suppression of a Field Population of *Aedes aegypti* in Brazil by Sustained Release of Transgenic Male Mosquitoes. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2015; 9(7):e0003864. doi: [10.1371/journal.pntd.0003864](#) PMID: [26135160](#)
8. Oxitec. Olive fly 2016. <http://www.oxitec.com/agriculture/our-products/olive-fly/>.
9. Creese C. Press release: Oxitec ‘self-limiting gene’ offers hope for controlling invasive moth without using pesticides 2015 [updated 2015-07-16; cited 2016 2016-02-04]. <http://www.oxitec.com/press-release-oxitec-self-limiting-gene-offers-hope-for-controlling-invasive-moth-without-using-pesticides/>.
10. Creese C. Press release: Australia trials Oxitec’s environmentally friendly medfly for protection of fruit crops 2015 [updated 2015-11-23; cited 2016 2016-02-04]. <http://www.oxitec.com/press-release-australia-trials-oxitecs-environmentally-friendly-medfly-for-protection-of-fruit-crops/>.
11. Baulcombe D, Dunwell J, Jones J, Pickett J, Puigdomenech P. GM Science Update: A report to the Council for Science and Technology. Council for Science and Technology; 2014.
12. Walport M. GM technologies. Council for Science and Technology, 2014 CST/14/634.
13. European Academies Science Advisory Council. Planting the future. 2013 June. Report No.: 21.
14. Science and Technology Select Committee. Genetically Modified Insects: 1st Report of Session 2015–16. House of Lords, Committee SaTS; 17 December 2015. Report No.
15. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity: text and annexes. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity; 2000.
16. World Health Organisation. The Guidance Framework for testing genetically modified mosquitoes Geneva: World Health Organisation; 2014.
17. Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 March 2001 on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms and repealing Council Directive 90/220/EEC—Commission Declaration, (2001).
18. Miller H, Conko G. The Protocol’s illusionary principle. *Nat Biotech*. 2000; 18(4):360-.
19. Ministry for Primary Industries. Importing Genetically Modified Organisms 2016. <http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/regs/imports/plants/gmo>.
20. Lee-Jones D. New Zealand: Biotechnology—GE Plants and Animals. Annual Update for Biotechnology in Agriculture. 2010 2010-07-15. Report No.
21. Mayer SJ. The regulation of genetically modified food. Volume 13: Social, Educational and Political Aspects of Biotechnology—An Overview and an Appraisal of Biotechnology in a Changing World—Part I 2009.
22. Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 March 2001 on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms and repealing Council Directive 90/220/EEC—Commission Declaration, 2001/18/EC (2001).
23. National Union of Farmers. Approval and Regulation of New Genetically Modified/Genetically Engineered Plant Varieties in Canada. 2013.

24. Ahmad T. Restrictions on Genetically Modified Organisms: Canada. 2014.
25. Oh, New Delhi; oh, Geneva. *Nature*. 1975; 256(5516):355–7.
26. Misplaced protest. *Nature*. 2012; 485(7397):147–8.
27. Zafar Y. Development of Agriculture Biotechnology in Pakistan. *Journal of AOAC International*. 2007; 90(5):1500–7. PMID: [17955999](#)
28. Subbaraman N. Science snipes at Oxitec transgenic-mosquito trial. *Nat Biotech*. 2011; 29(1):9–11.
29. Enserink M. GM Mosquito Trial Alarms Opponents, Strains Ties in Gates-Funded Project. *Science*. 2010; 330(6007):1030–1. doi: [10.1126/science.330.6007.1030](#) PMID: [21097909](#)
30. Wilcox C. No, GM Mosquitoes Didn't Start The Zika Outbreak. *Discover Magazine*. 2016.
31. Griffin A. Zika virus: Conspiracy theories about GMO mosquitoes and intentional infection spread as disease fears grow. *Independent*. 2016 8th February 2016.
32. Lynas M. Alert! There's a dangerous new viral outbreak: Zika conspiracy theories *The Guardian*. 2016.
33. Sturgis P, Allum N. Science in Society: Re-Evaluating the Deficit Model of Public Attitudes. *Public Understanding of Science*. 2004; 13(1):55–74. doi: [10.1177/0963662504042690](#)
34. Panjwani A, Wilson AJ. Genetically Modified Insects and Disease Control: Report on 10th February 2015 public event. The Pirbright Institute, 2015 27th February 2015. Report No.
35. GM insects and disease control. In: Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, editor. Houses of Parliament 2015.
36. Marshall JM. Chapter 11. Measuring public attitudes to releases of transgenic mosquitoes for disease control. *Biosafety for human health and the environment in the context of the potential use of genetically modified mosquitoes (GMMs)*. Geneva: WHO TDR; 2015. p. 242.
37. Kahan D. Pew's disappointing use of invalid survey methods on GM food risk perceptions Cultural Cognition Project, Yale Law School 2015 [cited 2016 2016-06-03]. <http://www.culturalcognition.net/blog/2015/1/31/weekend-update-pews-disappointing-use-of-invalid-survey-meth.html>.
38. Turley AP, Moreira LA, O'Neill SL, McGraw EA. *Wolbachia* Infection Reduces Blood-Feeding Success in the Dengue Fever Mosquito, *Aedes aegypti*. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2009; 3(9):e516. doi: [10.1371/journal.pntd.0000516](#) PMID: [19753103](#)
39. Hughes GL, Koga R, Xue P, Fukatsu T, Rasgon JL. *Wolbachia* Infections Are Virulent and Inhibit the Human Malaria Parasite *Plasmodium Falciparum* in *Anopheles Gambiae*. *PLoS Pathog*. 2011; 7(5): e1002043. doi: [10.1371/journal.ppat.1002043](#) PMID: [21625582](#)
40. Drobnik J. Time to relax GMO regulation in europe. *Plant Cell Tissue Organ Cult*. 2008; 94(3):235–8. doi: [10.1007/s11240-007-9331-3](#) PMID: [WOS:000258541100002](#).
41. Panel on Genetically Modified Organisms. Guidance on the environmental risk assessment of genetically modified animals. *EFSA Journal*. 2013; 11(5):3200–390. doi: [10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3200](#)
42. Gantz VM, Jasinskiene N, Tatarenkova O, Fazekas A, Macias VM, Bier E, et al. Highly efficient Cas9-mediated gene drive for population modification of the malaria vector mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2015; 112(49): E6736–E43. doi: [10.1073/pnas.1521077112](#) PMID: [WOS:000365989800007](#).