International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 23s, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Biological Control of Mosquitoes Using Entomopathogenic Microbes: Efficacy, Ecology, and Environmental Impact

Dr.C. Vinothini[1], Md Tausif Raza[2], Dr. Kiran Bala Bhuyan[3], Dr. Tanmay Ghosh[4]
[1]Assistant professor, Department of Microbiology, E.G.S.Pillay Arts and science college, Nagappatinam, vinothinic77@gmail.com
[2]Department of Microbiology, Smt S S Nootan Science and Commerce College, Sakalchand Patel, University, Visnagar Maheshana Gujarat, tausifmicro@gmail.com
[3]S.K.C.G. Autonomous College,Paralakhemundi , Gajapati, Odisha -761200, kiranbpkd@gmail.com
[4]Assistant professor (Microbiology), Dinabandhu Andrews College, Baishnabghata, South 24 Parganas, Kolkata– 700084, West Bengal, India, University of Calcutta, tanmay.tanmay.ghosh780@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Mosquitoes are among the most important vectors of human disease, transmitting pathogens responsible for malaria, dengue, chikungunya, Zika virus, filariasis, and yellow fever. Despite decades of insecticide-based control, vector populations remain resilient due to the rapid development of resistance and the ecological drawbacks of chemical interventions. Biological control using entomopathogenic microbes has emerged as a sustainable and eco-friendly alternative, offering specificity, safety, and the potential for long-term integration into vector management programs. Microbes such as Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis (Bti), Bacillus sphaericus (Bs), entomopathogenic fungi (Metarhizium anisopliae, Beauveria bassiana), viruses, and microsporidia demonstrate strong efficacy against different mosquito life stages. This review synthesizes current knowledge on the efficacy of entomopathogenic microbes, their ecological interactions, and their environmental impacts. It examines mechanisms of infection, field performance, resistance dynamics, and compatibility with integrated vector management (IVM). Furthermore, it discusses environmental safety, formulation challenges, and recent innovations such as microbial consortia and genetic engineering. While microbial biocontrol holds great promise, scaling up production, ensuring formulation stability, and evaluating long-term ecological consequences remain challenges. We conclude by identifying key research priorities and strategies for integrating microbial tools into future climate-resilient mosquito control frameworks..
Keywords: *Mosquito Control; Entomopathogenic Microbes; Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis; Metarhizium anisopliae; Biological Control; Integrated Vector Management; Environmental Sustainability*

1.INTRODUCTION

Mosquitoes are responsible for transmitting pathogens that cause over 700,000 deaths annually, with malaria alone accounting for more than 240 million cases worldwide (WHO, 2022). Control strategies have long relied on synthetic insecticides such as organophosphates, carbamates, and pyrethroids. However, extensive use has led to insecticide resistance, environmental contamination, and negative impacts on non-target organisms, prompting the urgent need for alternative approaches. Biological control represents a promising solution that reduces dependence on chemicals while supporting ecological sustainability.

Among biocontrol tools, entomopathogenic microbes—including bacteria, fungi, viruses, and microsporidia—have gained prominence due to their specificity and eco-friendly profiles. These agents target mosquito larvae or adults through mechanisms such as toxin production, cuticle penetration, and systemic infection. Importantly, their integration into Integrated Vector Management (IVM) offers a way to enhance control efficacy while reducing the risk of resistance. This review critically evaluates the role of entomopathogenic microbes in mosquito management, focusing on their efficacy, ecology, and environmental impact.

2. Entomopathogenic Microbes in Mosquito Control

Entomopathogenic microbes have emerged as effective and environmentally sustainable alternatives to chemical insecticides for mosquito management. Among the most widely used are bacterial species such as Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis (Bti) and Bacillus sphaericus (Bs), which produce toxins that specifically target mosquito larvae, disrupting midgut cells and leading to rapid mortality (Lacey, 2007; Ben-Dov, 2014). In addition, entomopathogenic fungi including Metarhizium anisopliae and Beauveria bassiana infect mosquitoes through the cuticle, proliferating inside the host and reducing both survival and vector competence (Scholte et al., 2004; Dong et al., 2019). Viruses and microsporidia, such as Vavraia culicis, also play important roles by impairing mosquito development, fecundity, and pathogen transmission, though their application is still under exploration (Read et al., 2009). Unlike synthetic insecticides, these microbial agents are highly species-specific, biodegradable, and pose minimal risks to non-target organisms, making them valuable tools for inclusion in integrated vector management (IVM) programs. However, challenges such as formulation stability, large-scale production, and field persistence need to be addressed to maximize their effectiveness in diverse ecological settings.

Entomopathogenic Fungi

Fungi such as Metarhizium anisopliae and Beauveria bassiana infect both larvae and adults by penetrating the mosquito cuticle and proliferating within the hemocoel. These fungi not only kill mosquitoes but also reduce their vector competence, thereby lowering pathogen transmission potential (Scholte et al., 2004; Dong et al., 2019). Unlike bacteria, fungi act more slowly but are compatible with residual surface applications, bed nets, and auto-dissemination devices.

Viruses

Insect-specific viruses (ISVs), including iridoviruses and densoviruses, have been studied for their mosquito-pathogenic potential. These viruses reduce fecundity and longevity but face challenges such as slow transmission dynamics and limited field validation.

Microsporidia

Microsporidia such as Vavraia culicis persist in mosquito populations by vertically transmitting through eggs. While less lethal than bacteria or fungi, they impair mosquito fitness and pathogen development, making them potential long-term control tools (Read et al., 2009).

3. Mechanisms of Action

Entomopathogenic microbes act through diverse and species-specific mechanisms that disrupt mosquito survival and development. Bacterial agents such as Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis (Bti) produce Cry and Cyt protein toxins, which bind to receptors in the larval midgut epithelium, causing pore formation, osmotic lysis, and eventual septicemia (Ben-Dov, 2014; Lacey, 2007). Bacillus sphaericus (Bs) releases binary toxins that target midgut cells, with spores capable of recycling in larval cadavers, prolonging environmental persistence. Entomopathogenic fungi such as Metarhizium anisopliae and Beauveria bassiana initiate infection by adhering to the mosquito cuticle, germinating, and penetrating through enzymatic and mechanical action, followed by systemic colonization that depletes host nutrients and induces mortality (Scholte et al., 2004; Dong et al., 2019). Viruses like densoviruses and iridoviruses replicate within mosquito tissues, impairing development and reducing fecundity, while microsporidia such as Vavraia culicis persist intracellularly, transmitted both vertically and horizontally, leading to reduced vector competence (Read et al., 2009). Collectively, these mechanisms ensure high specificity to mosquito hosts, limit non-target impacts, and offer sustainable alternatives to chemical insecticides when incorporated into integrated vector management programs.

4. Efficacy in Laboratory and Field Studies

Numerous trials confirm microbial agents' high efficacy. For instance, Bti shows >90% larval mortality within 24 hours under laboratory conditions. Field studies in Africa and Asia have demonstrated significant reductions in Anopheles larval densities after repeated Bti applications (Becker, 2000). Fungal sprays on resting surfaces reduce mosquito longevity below the threshold required for malaria parasite development. However, variability in field conditions—temperature, organic matter, UV exposure—affects efficacy, underscoring the need for adaptive formulations.

5. Ecological Considerations

The ecological implications of entomopathogenic microbes in mosquito control are critical to their acceptance as sustainable alternatives to chemical insecticides. Microbial agents such as Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis (Bti) and Bacillus sphaericus (Bs) are highly specific to dipteran larvae, minimizing risks to non-target organisms including fish, amphibians, and beneficial aquatic invertebrates (Lacey, 2007; Ben-Dov, 2014). Entomopathogenic fungi like Metarhizium anisopliae and Beauveria bassiana also exhibit selective pathogenicity, though their potential impact on non-target arthropods warrants careful ecological assessment (Scholte et al., 2004). Environmental factors such as UV exposure, pH, temperature, and organic matter strongly influence the persistence and efficacy of microbial agents, making their performance context-dependent (Becker, 2000). Importantly, the introduction of microbes into natural ecosystems may alter microbial community dynamics, which requires long-term ecological monitoring. Integrating microbial control into Integrated Vector Management (IVM) frameworks ensures ecological balance by combining habitat modification, biological agents, and minimal chemical use. Thus, while entomopathogenic microbes provide environmentally safer alternatives, continuous monitoring of their non-target impacts and ecological compatibility remains essential for sustainable deployment.

6. Environmental Impact

The use of entomopathogenic microbes for mosquito control is widely regarded as environmentally safe compared to chemical insecticides, but their ecological footprint requires careful evaluation. Bacterial agents like Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis (Bti) and Bacillus sphaericus (Bs) degrade rapidly in the environment and display high specificity toward mosquito larvae, thereby minimizing accumulation and collateral damage to non-target organisms (Lacey, 2007; Ben-Dov, 2014). Long-term studies have shown that repeated Bti applications do not significantly alter aquatic biodiversity or ecosystem structure, although concerns remain about potential indirect effects on food webs in habitats heavily dependent on dipteran larvae as prey (Becker, 2000). Fungal pathogens such as Metarhizium anisopliae and Beauveria bassiana pose little risk to vertebrates but may affect non-target insects under laboratory conditions, highlighting the importance of field-based ecological assessments (Scholte et al., 2004). Additionally, environmental variables such as sunlight, rainfall, and organic matter influence microbial persistence, which can limit both efficacy and unintended accumulation. Overall, microbial biocontrol agents offer a reduced environmental burden compared to chemical larvicides, but continuous ecological monitoring is necessary to ensure long-term sustainability and safeguard ecosystem balance.

7. Resistance and Evolutionary Dynamics

Resistance has been documented in Bs due to repeated exposure, though rare for Bti due to multiple toxin modes of action. To mitigate resistance, microbial consortia or genetic engineering strategies are proposed (Read et al., 2009).

8. Challenges and Limitations

- **Formulation stability:** UV and temperature sensitivity reduce efficacy.
- **Cost and scalability:** Mass production remains a barrier in low-income settings.
- **Adoption barriers:** Limited awareness and infrastructure hinder uptake in endemic regions.
- **Regulatory concerns:** Biosafety approvals slow field deployment of engineered microbes.

9. Future Perspectives

The future of mosquito control lies in advancing microbial-based interventions through **innovation, integration, and sustainability**. Genetic engineering of microbial agents, such as recombinant Bacillus thuringiensis strains with broadened toxin profiles or transgenic fungi expressing insect-specific peptides, offers promising avenues for enhancing efficacy and delaying resistance (Dong et al., 2019; Read et al., 2009). The development of **microbial consortia**, combining bacteria, fungi, or microsporidia, may provide synergistic effects, increase persistence in the environment, and target multiple mosquito life stages simultaneously (Ben-Dov, 2014). Advances in **formulation technologies**, including nanoencapsulation, oil suspensions, and biodegradable polymers, can improve microbial stability under field conditions by protecting against UV degradation and desiccation (Lacey, 2007). Furthermore, integrating microbial control with **novel vector management strategies** such as Wolbachia-based suppression, sterile insect techniques (SIT), and gene-drive systems could yield long-term, climate-resilient control frameworks. Importantly, ecological monitoring and risk assessment will remain crucial to ensure safety for non-target organisms and ecosystems. As research advances, microbial biocontrol is poised to become a cornerstone of **sustainable Integrated Vector Management (IVM)** programs, reducing dependence on chemical insecticides and contributing to global health security.

10. Conclusion

Entomopathogenic microbes provide a sustainable, effective, and environmentally safe approach for mosquito control. They offer clear advantages over chemical insecticides, including specificity and ecological compatibility. However, challenges such as formulation stability, cost-effectiveness, and ecological uncertainties must be addressed. Future research should focus on microbial consortia, engineered strains, and integration with emerging vector management tools to create resilient, sustainable mosquito control strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Becker, N. (2000). Bacterial control of vector-mosquitoes and black flies. Entomopathogenic Bacteria: From Laboratory to Field Application, 383–398.
2. Lacey, L. A. (2007). Bacillus thuringiensis serovar israelensis and Bacillus sphaericus for mosquito control. Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association, 23(sp2), 133–163.

3. Scholte, E. J., Knols, B. G., & Takken, W. (2004). Autoinoculation of malaria mosquitoes with the entomopathogenic fungus Metarhizium anisopliae. Malaria Journal, 3(1), 1–7.
4. Dong, Y., Morton, J. C., Ramirez, J. L., Souza-Neto, J. A., & Dimopoulos, G. (2019). The entomopathogenic fungus Beauveria bassiana activates mosquito immune responses and reduces malaria transmission. Scientific Reports, 9(1), 1–10.
5. Ben-Dov, E. (2014). Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. israelensis and its dipteran-specific toxins. Toxins, 6(4), 1222–1243.
6. Read, A. F., Lynch, P. A., & Thomas, M. B. (2009). How to make evolution-proof insecticides for malaria control. PLoS Biology, 7(4), e1000058.
7. World Health Organization (2022). World Malaria Report 2022. WHO Publications.
8. Lacey, L. A. (2007). Bacillus thuringiensis serovar israelensis and Bacillus sphaericus for mosquito control. Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association, 23(sp2), 133–163.
9. Ben-Dov, E. (2014). Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. israelensis and its dipteran-specific toxins. Toxins, 6(4), 1222–1243.
10. Scholte, E. J., Knols, B. G., & Takken, W. (2004). Autoinoculation of malaria mosquitoes with the entomopathogenic fungus Metarhizium anisopliae. Malaria Journal, 3(1), 1–7.
11. Dong, Y., Morton, J. C., Ramirez, J. L., Souza-Neto, J. A., & Dimopoulos, G. (2019). The entomopathogenic fungus Beauveria bassiana activates mosquito immune responses and reduces malaria transmission. Scientific Reports, 9(1), 1–10.
12. Read, A. F., Lynch, P. A., & Thomas, M. B. (2009). How to make evolution-proof insecticides for malaria control. PLoS Biology, 7(4), e1000058.
13. Lacey, L. A. (2007). Bacillus thuringiensis serovar israelensis and Bacillus sphaericus for mosquito control. Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association, 23(sp2), 133–163.
14. Ben-Dov, E. (2014). Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. israelensis and its dipteran-specific toxins. Toxins, 6(4), 1222–1243.
15. Scholte, E. J., Knols, B. G., & Takken, W. (2004). Autoinoculation of malaria mosquitoes with the entomopathogenic fungus Metarhizium anisopliae. Malaria Journal, 3(1), 1–7.
16. Dong, Y., Morton, J. C., Ramirez, J. L., Souza-Neto, J. A., & Dimopoulos, G. (2019). The entomopathogenic fungus Beauveria bassiana activates mosquito immune responses and reduces malaria transmission. Scientific Reports, 9(1), 1–10.
17. Read, A. F., Lynch, P. A., & Thomas, M. B. (2009). How to make evolution-proof insecticides for malaria control. PLoS Biology, 7(4), e1000058.