



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/238514/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Alphey, Luke Stephen, Harvey-Samuel, Tim, Kaur, Rajdeep et al. (Accepted: 2026)
Sequence mismatch between gene-drive and target-site flanking regions significantly
impairs homing efficiency in *Culex quinquefasciatus*. *Genetics*. ISSN: 0016-6731 (In
Press)

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 Title: Sequence mismatch between gene-drive and target-site flanking
2 regions significantly impairs homing efficiency in *Culex quinquefasciatus*.

3

4 **Authors**

5 Harvey-Samuel, T.^{1,2}, Kaur, R.², Leftwich, P.T.³, Feng, X.⁴, Gantz, V.⁵, Alphey, L.^{6,7}

6 ¹ School of Life Sciences, Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire, ST5 5GB, UK

7 ² Arthropod Genetics, The Pirbright Institute, Woking, UK, GU24 0NF, UK

8 ³ School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park,
9 Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK

10 ⁴ Key Laboratory of Biology of Crop Pathogens and Insects of Zhejiang Province, College
11 of Agriculture and Biotechnology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China

12 ⁵ Section of Cell and Developmental Biology, University of California San Diego, San
13 Diego, California, 92093, USA

14 ⁶ Department of Biology, University of York, Wentworth Way, York, YO10 5DD, UK

15 ⁷ York Biomedical Research Institute, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD,
16 UK

17

18 Corresponding author: Luke Alphey: luke.alphey@york.ac.uk

19 Keywords: Homology Directed Repair, gene-drive, Homing Endonuclease Gene, west
20 Nile virus, avian malaria

21 Running Title: Target mismatch impairs homing-drive efficiency

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 **Abstract**

31 CRISPR/Cas9-based homing gene-drives (homing-drives) hold enormous potential as
32 control tools for mosquito disease-vectors. These genomically-encoded technologies
33 spread themselves through target populations by creating double-stranded DNA breaks
34 on homologous chromosomes, into which the homing-drives are copied ('homed').
35 Homing is dependent on sequence homology between the genomic regions flanking the
36 transgene insertion and the break site. Homing efficiency (i.e. copying rate) substantially
37 impacts the power of these systems: less efficient homing-drives spread slower, have
38 fewer applications and are more resistance-prone. Understanding what influences
39 homing-drive efficiency is therefore vital to the successful use of these technologies.
40 Here we report a novel mechanism by which a homing-drive's efficiency can be
41 significantly impaired by natural sequence variation within a population into which it is
42 spreading. Using a *kmo*-targeting 'split' homing-drive in the West Nile virus mosquito
43 *Culex quinquefasciatus*, we found that target-site heterology (sequence mismatch
44 between the genomic regions flanking the target cut-site and the homing-drive transgene)
45 of less than 10% reduced homing efficiency by up to 54%. While substantial research
46 effort has been dedicated to increasing homing-drive efficiency through optimisation of
47 within-construct components, our results highlight that the real-world efficacy of these
48 systems may in part depend on variation beyond these controllable factors.

49

50

51 **Article Summary**

52 Homing-based gene-drives are transformative pest control tools. They work by spreading
53 through the gene-pool of a target-pest population, affecting its control. This spreading is
54 achieved by 'homing': where the gene-drive copies itself from one homologous
55 chromosome to another. Homing requires DNA sequences either side (i.e. flanking) the
56 gene-drive to match those of the site it is copying into. Using a homing gene-drive in the
57 mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* we assess how sequence mismatches between these
58 flanking regions affect homing efficiency. We find even small levels of mismatch can
59 significantly reduce homing and discuss this in the context of real-world gene-drive
60 deployment.

61 **Introduction**

62 CRISPR/Cas9 'homing' gene-drives (henceforth homing-drives) are genomically
63 encoded technologies which hold immense promise for controlling intractable pests, with
64 notable development in disease-vectoring mosquitoes (Alphey, 2014; Anderson et al.,
65 2024; Gantz et al., 2015; Hammond et al., 2016; Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023; Li et al.,
66 2020; Sinkins & Gould, 2006). A homing-drive increases its allele frequency from one

67 generation to the next by copying ('homing') itself from one homologous chromosome to
68 another in germline cells (Burt, 2003). For pest management, a homing-drive can be
69 designed to simultaneously spread traits beneficial for control e.g. pathogen
70 refractoriness or a genetic load for population suppression/eradication (Champer et al.,
71 2016). The efficiency of the homing reaction substantially influences the population-level
72 efficacy of a homing-drive: higher homing rates enable faster spread and higher tolerance
73 of drive-associated fitness costs (Deredec et al., 2008).

74 At a molecular level, homing occurs when Cas9 expressed by a homing-drive transgene
75 creates a double-stranded DNA break (henceforth 'cut-site') at a specific sequence on
76 the target chromosome, into which the homing-drive is homed (Esvelt et al., 2014) (Fig
77 1.). Homing is mediated by the homology-directed-repair (HDR) pathway, requiring the
78 genomic sequences flanking the homing-drive transgene insertion-site and the target
79 allele cut-site to show homology. While substantial effort has been devoted to exploring
80 how 'within-drive' components (e.g. regulatory elements for expressing Cas9 (Anderson
81 et al., 2023; Hammond et al., 2021)) affect homing rates, comparatively little attention has
82 been paid to the role of these genomic flanking regions in influencing homing efficiency.
83 This is surprising as the impact of even minor sequence divergence between loci in
84 substantially reducing homologous recombination rates is well established (Elliott et al.,
85 1998). In the real-world, homing-drives will be required to function in genetically diverse
86 'wild' populations, which will likely also include pre-existing heterogeneity around the cut-
87 site. Whether sequence mismatch (henceforth 'heterology') between a homing-drive's
88 flanking genomic regions and those flanking its target allele cut-site influences homing
89 rates is thus of considerable importance.

90 We explored this question using our homing-drive system in the West-Nile-virus vector
91 mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* (Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023). This system consists of
92 a 'split-drive' design where the two homing-drive components (germline-expressing Cas9
93 and gRNA-expressing cassettes) are integrated at independent loci - one of which (here
94 the gRNA-cassette) is in the target allele - and maintained in separate lines (Esvelt et al.,
95 2014). The two lines can then be crossed together to initiate the homing reaction in trans-
96 heterozygotes. By using the *kynurinine 3-monooxygenase* (*kmo*) gene as our target allele
97 (where homozygous null mutations give an easily visualized 'white-eye' phenotype
98 (Purusothaman et al., 2021)) and conducting all comparison crosses in a 'controlled'
99 genetic background, we were able to unambiguously distinguish Cas9-mediated cutting
100 and homing, and attribute variation in these to individual *kmo* target alleles which
101 displayed varying levels of heterology. This experimental design provided unparalleled
102 power to assess this fundamentally important question.

103 **Materials and methods**

104 Ethics

105 Work followed procedures/protocols approved by The Pirbright Institute Biological Agents
106 & Genetic Modification Safety Committee. All homing assays were conducted at The
107 Pirbright Institute IS4L arthropod containment facility under the necessary safety
108 regulations for gene-drive research.

109 Mosquito lines used, rearing and maintenance.

110 The *kmo*-gRNA line was generated previously by integrating a *kmo*-gRNA expression
111 cassette via CRISPR/Cas9 HDR into the *kmo* gene in the TPRI (Tropical Pesticides
112 Research Institute) genetic background. The *kmo* *-/-* line was generated previously by
113 CRISPR/Cas9 knockout of the *kmo* gene in the CA (California) genetic background. The
114 *Vasa*-Cas9 line was generated previously by integrating a Cas9 ORF under the
115 transcriptional control of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* *Vasa* regulatory elements into the *Cardinal*
116 gene in the CA genetic background via CRISPR/Cas9 HDR. The Wild-type (WT) line is
117 the unmodified TPRI line. Rearing/maintenance followed procedures previously reported.

118 Mosquito experiments

119 Assay 1: Allele-by-allele approach

120 Homozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 females were first pool-crossed to WT males, producing
121 heterozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 F1 progeny in a 50:50 TPRI/CA genetic background. Female
122 F1 were then pool-crossed to heterozygous *kmo*-gRNA males to give the F2 generation.
123 Trans-heterozygous *Vasa*-Cas9, *kmo*-gRNA female F2 progeny were then pool-crossed
124 to *kmo**-/-* males and F3 egg-rafts produced individually isolated, with each egg-raft being
125 from an individual female trans-heterozygote. L3-4 stage progeny from each egg-raft
126 were scored for presence of transgenes/eye-pigmentation (white-eyes), as previously
127 demonstrated.

128 Genotyping of target allele (Assay 1 only)

129 After scoring, gDNA was extracted from a single WT or *Vasa*-Cas9 individual from each
130 F3 egg-raft (Machery-Nagel Nucleospin Tissue kit, Düren, Germany). This was used to
131 PCR-genotype the maternally-contributed *kmo* allele (i.e. the allele into which the *kmo*-
132 gRNA had attempted to home in the previous generation). The paternally-contributed *kmo*
133 allele was excluded by designing the reverse primer (PL506) to lie across a region deleted
134 during the generation of the *kmo* *-/-* line. The primers were designed to bind to all 4 *kmo*
135 alleles identified in a preliminary analysis of the strains utilized (A,B,C,D). PCR conditions
136 as follows 98C-1min, (98C-30s, 72C-15s, 72C-1min) x 35, 72C-2min. 200ng of gDNA
137 used per 50ul Q5 PCR Reaction (New England Biolabs). Primers = F(PL303):
138 CCAACATTACCTTCACTTCAACCACAAGC and R(PL506):

139 GTGAGCGTCCTCCCACCGAG. Amplicons extended c.320/540bp
140 upstream/downstream of the cut site – sufficient distance to distinguish the 4 alleles.
141 Reactions were run on a 1% agarose gel and bands extracted using the Machery-nagel
142 Nucleospin Gel and PCR clean-up kit. Purified bands were Sanger sequenced using the
143 forward primer PL303 and sequenced amplicons aligned to the TPRI *kmo* sequence.

144 Calculation of homing and cutting rates (Assay 1 only)

145 Homing rates are defined as the percentage of homologous wild-type chromosomes
146 converted to carry the *kmo*-gRNA transgene (i.e. the percentage of WT alleles which have
147 been affected by homing). It was estimated for each egg-raft as $(200 \times (\text{no. } kmo\text{-gRNA}/\text{total progeny} - 0.5))$. Cutting rate is defined as the percentage of homologous wild-
148 type chromosomes observed as having been cut by Cas9. This includes DSBs that were
149 repaired via HDR (homing), NHEJ (or other error-prone mechanisms) but excludes
150 repairs which resulted in no observable change to the WT allele (perfect repair). It was
151 estimated for each egg-raft as the previously estimated homing rate + $(200 \times (\text{no. non-}$
152 *kmo*-gRNA progeny which showed white-eyes/total progeny - 0.5)). That is, the HDR +
153 error-prone pathway rates.
154

155 Assay 2: Generalising findings

156 Homozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 females were first pool-crossed to WT males, producing
157 heterozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 F1 progeny in a 50:50 TPRI/CA genetic background. This was
158 repeated twice to give F3 *Vasa*-Cas9 progeny in a predominantly TPRI genetic
159 background (c. 87.5% TPRI alleles). Male and female *Vasa*-Cas9 heterozygote F3s were
160 pool-crossed to female and male *kmo*-gRNA line heterozygotes, respectively, giving two
161 cohorts in the F4 generation (one from each of the two F3 crosses). Trans-heterozygous
162 male and female F4 progeny from each of these two crosses were pool-crossed to female
163 and male *kmo* *-/-* individuals, respectively (4 crosses total), and the egg rafts produced
164 individually isolated and scored as for Assay 1.

165 Statistical analysis

166 Homing and cutting rates were both analysed with generalized linear mixed models with
167 a binomial (logit) error distribution. Fixed effects for Assay 1 were the genotyped
168 maternally contributed *kmo* allele with individual female egg-batch as a random effect.
169 Minor overdispersion in the cutting analysis models meant all 95% confidence intervals
170 were checked by semi-parametric bootstrapping (1000 iterations). Results are presented
171 with model-based standard errors and 95% confidence intervals; bootstrap validation
172 confirmed these estimates were robust to minor overdispersion and both summaries are
173 presented in supplementary materials (supplementary tables 1 & 2). For Assay 2 fixed
174 effects included the sex of the Cas9-bearing parent and grandparent as well as whether

175 the data came from the original (i.e. previously published) experiment or post-
176 introgression (i.e. Assay 2). Individual female egg-batches were also included as a
177 random effect. All models and simulations were constructed in R version 4.3.3 with the
178 package lmerTest, model fits were checked with the package DHARMA and model
179 predictions generated with the package emmeans. Data processing and visualization was
180 performed with the tidyverse packages.

181

182 **Results and Discussion**

183 Our aim was to investigate the effect of varying the heterology of sequences flanking the
184 cut-site of a target allele on a homing-drive's homing efficiency. We assessed this at two
185 distinct levels, each specifically designed to give insight into the behavior of this potential
186 effect. Firstly, we took an 'allele-by-allele' approach – assessing a homing-drive's
187 efficiency as it was paired against four different *kmo* target alleles in a controlled genetic
188 background. Secondly, we extended this analysis to a broader range of cross schemes
189 and sexes to assess the generality of findings.

190 1: Allele-by-allele approach

191 In 'split' homing-drives, one of the expression cassettes (here, that expressing the gRNA)
192 is integrated into the target allele at the precise cut-site, forming the 'homing-element'.
193 This can then be combined with the other element, here encoding Cas9, to provide trans-
194 heterozygotes (aka "double heterozygotes") which have one copy each of Cas9 and
195 homing-element and so can catalyse the homing reaction. Furthermore, and crucially for
196 our purpose, in this set-up, the target allele into which a homing-element attempts to home
197 will always come from the line (and therefore the genetic background) which contributed
198 the Cas9 transgene. Preliminary analysis of our highly inbred wild-type (WT) line (in which
199 the *kmo*-gRNA line was generated and is outcrossed to each generation – TPRI genetic
200 background – see methods) and the *Vasa*-Cas9 line (which was generated separately in
201 the CA genetic background – see methods) showed that these two lines possessed highly
202 divergent *kmo* allele sequences. Those carrying the TPRI genetic background contained
203 only a single *kmo* sequence (allele A) which perfectly matched the sequences flanking
204 the integrated *kmo*-gRNA homing-element, while the *Vasa*-Cas9 line contained three
205 different *kmo* allele sequences (alleles B, C and D – back calculated from subsequent
206 genotyping data to be represented at frequencies of 0.15, 0.65 and 0.2, respectively, in
207 that strain) (See figure 2A), each of which showed substantial sequence variation as
208 compared to allele A, especially in the area 5' of the gRNA target site which harbors
209 intronic sequence (See Supplementary Figure 1). We took advantage of this to design an
210 assay in which a Cas9-bearing individual could contribute a variety of target alleles to a
211 homing cross, some but not all of which would match the homing-element flanking
212 sequences but, critically, all of which would end up in the same mixed genetic background

213 (see figure 2B). These female trans-heterozygotes (*kmo*-gRNA/+^{A,B,C or D}, *Vasa-Cas9*/+) were then crossed to male *kmo* -/- homozygotes to allow us to detect both homing (deviation in inheritance rate of homing-element from Mendelian expectation of 50%) and the rate of end-joining (individuals inheriting loss-of-function *kmo* alleles from their mother, generated via Cas9 cutting followed by error-prone repair, will have white eyes but lack the fluorescent marker of the homing-element) in their progeny. This assay showed a highly significant effect of the *kmo* target allele (i.e. A,B,C or D) on homing rate (LRT: $\chi^2_3 = 16.17$, $p = 0.001$), with a 54% difference in estimated homing rates associated with the highest (A = 0.37 [95% CI; 0.31 – 0.42]) and the lowest (D = 0.17 [0.06 – 0.27]) *kmo* target alleles (Figure 3, Supplementary Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary Table 2). Preliminary sequencing confirmed that the gRNA target sequence was present in all four *kmo* alleles and this was confirmed by our comparison of estimated cutting rates (i.e. estimated homing + observed end-joining) between the *kmo* alleles, which did not significantly differ (LRT: $\chi^2_3 = 5.27$, $p = 0.15$; Supplementary Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary Table 2). This suggests that the differences in homing we observed between the four target *kmo* alleles were not simply driven by Cas9 being able to cut some alleles more efficiently than others. Instead, taken together, these data strongly suggest that the mechanism underlying the observed reduction in homing is impairment of homology-directed repair through drive-target allele flanking sequence mismatch. Of note, this effect was observable despite the fact that the vast majority of sequence heterology occurred only on one side (i.e. 5') of the target site. While the nature of available *kmo* alleles did not allow us to investigate heterology structure beyond this, results from *Drosophila melanogaster* 'transcomplementing' homing-drives (López Del Amo et al., 2020a) suggest that the presence of heterologous sequences on both sides of the target site may further impair homing efficiency. Further experiments with a wider variety of *kmo* alleles, or employing target genes with less conservation in coding regions, would enable exploration of the effect of more evenly distributed heterology on homing.

240 2: Generalised approach

241 In the real world, homing-drive transgenes could be inherited from, and be active in, either sex. Previous work has shown that the efficiencies and dynamics of homing-drives can vary dramatically dependent on direction of inheritance (paternal/maternal) in parents and grandparents (e.g. (Anderson et al., 2024; López Del Amo et al., 2020b; Terradas et al., 2021)). As such, we were interested in investigating the extent to which the observed influence of heterology on homing rates was maintained when a wider variety of cross combinations were considered. To achieve this, we first introgressed the *Vasa-Cas9* transgene into the TPRI genetic background by outcrossing *Vasa-Cas9* individuals to our TPRI wild-type line for three consecutive generations. This TPRI introgressed *Vasa-Cas9* line (henceforth *Vasa-Cas9*ⁱ) was then crossed to the *kmo*-gRNA line in a full factorial homing-drive cross (i.e. where the *Vasa-Cas9* and *kmo*-gRNA transgenes were inherited

252 from both grandparental (F0) sexes and the trans-heterozygous (F1) individuals were of
253 either sex) and results compared to our previously published homing analysis of these
254 two transgenes - in that case where the *Vasa-Cas9* transgene was in a pure CA genetic
255 background (Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023). We found that in all like-for-like comparisons
256 the homing rates in this study were higher than in our previous study (aggregate
257 difference 57.8% - 69.3%), only in the male-male crosses was this increase not
258 statistically significant (Figure 4, Supplementary Table 3). This significant interaction
259 between experiment and sex could possibly be indicative of a difference in response to
260 flanking-site heterology between sexes, in the context of homing drives. That is, when
261 faced with high heterology, males showed a higher level of homing than females – an
262 effect which largely disappeared when heterology was decreased (i.e. females increased
263 their homing rates to ‘male’ levels when drive and target-site flanking regions increased
264 in homology). A possible biological explanation for this observation could be a difference
265 in the recognition requirements for engaging HDR in the male and female germlines,
266 however further work would be required to explore this hypothesis. Overall, these results
267 further support our conclusion that target-site/homing-element flanking-sequence
268 heterology can significantly affect homing efficiency.

269 To date, only one other study has directly explored the influence of significant (i.e. >1%)
270 flanking-sequence heterology on homing-drive performance (in *Anopheles gambiae*)
271 (Pescod et al., 2023). In contrast to the results presented here, that study observed no
272 significant influence of target-site heterology on homing-efficacy, despite similar levels of
273 sequence divergence (5.3-6.6% over c.690bp). What might explain the differences
274 between this finding and ours? We propose three non-exclusive possibilities.

275 The first involves the genetic backgrounds in which these crosses were conducted.
276 Pescod *et al.* (Pescod et al., 2023) crossed their homing-drive directly into different
277 geographically distinct *An. gambiae* strains, each of which contained divergent target
278 alleles. As such, each of the different homing-drive/target allele assessments occurred in
279 a distinct genetic background. As it has been shown that (as with ‘natural’ homologous
280 recombination (Mansai et al., 2011)) many loci unlinked to a homing-drive may exert
281 significant influence over homing efficiencies (Champer et al., 2019), this experimental
282 design may have introduced additional variation, potentially obscuring the effects as
283 observed here. We were able to control for these potential epistatic effects by crossing,
284 and therefore partially introgressing, our *Vasa-Cas9* line into the TPRI background prior
285 to homing assays, ensuring each of our *kmo* target allele comparisons occurred within
286 (on average) the same, mixed CA/TPRI genetic background.

287 Secondly, there are potentially species-specific explanations for these contrasting results.
288 Homing-drive efficiencies in *Anopheline* mosquitoes are uniquely high (often approaching
289 or reaching 100%) (e.g. (Carballar-Lejarazú et al., 2023)). The precise reason for this is
290 unknown but could include less stringent requirements on engaging the HDR pathway

291 e.g. higher tolerance to flanking-sequence heterology, or smaller flanking sequences
292 required to initiate homing. Indeed, analysis of homing conversion tract lengths in *An.*
293 *gambiae* (i.e the degree to which the flanking regions of a target allele are converted to
294 carry heterologous sequences contained within the homing-drive flanking regions)
295 showed that (beyond the homing-drive cassette itself) only small sequences are
296 transferred onto the target chromosome (>80% of conversion tracts <50bp) (Pescod et
297 al., 2024). This is substantially shorter than reported for studies considering ‘natural’
298 homologous recombination in other species (typically c. 200bp (Mansai et al., 2011)) and
299 may signify shorter required sequences for RAD51-dependent complementary strand
300 recognition/invasion in *Anopheles*. In contrast, conversion tract lengths in *Aedes aegypti*,
301 another Culicine mosquito, following CRISPR-Cas9 plasmid-based knock-in (also
302 dependent on HDR, though likely occurring in somatic rather than germline cells) were
303 substantially longer (mean of 160bp) (Ang et al., 2022). Interestingly, and in concurrence
304 with our results, that study in *Ae. aegypti* also identified significant negative effects of
305 plasmid/target-site heterology on the efficiency of knock-in. Taken together, these results
306 could suggest that the HDR-pathway in *An. gambiae* is simply less affected by sequence
307 heterology than in other species, including Culicine mosquitoes.

308 Finally, the near-100% homing rates displayed by the drives tested in Pescod *et al* may
309 have made it difficult to observe anything other than extremely large changes (i.e. in this
310 case reductions) in homing, potentially underestimating or missing ‘subtler’ modifiers of
311 homing-efficiency – e.g. those caused by target alleles less amenable to homing. This is
312 because in a homing-drive, inheritance-bias (i.e. the level of homing) is described by odds
313 ($p/(1-p)$) – where p = wild-type allele conversion probability - and the effect of a change
314 in odds on the change in homing rate differs substantially depending on the initial level of
315 homing ((Deredec et al., 2008), concept visualised in Supplementary Figure 3). In
316 essence, for homing-drives which display very high homing-rates, even large changes
317 (e.g. reductions) in odds (*i.e. reductions in the probability of homing*) will have only small
318 effects on the observed levels of homing. This effect is much less pronounced in less
319 efficient homing-drives (i.e. where homing rates are closer to 0), like that demonstrated
320 here. The diminishing return on changes in odds means that, near 100% efficiency, subtle
321 effects on homing may go unnoticed, complicating efforts to accurately evaluate or
322 identify modifiers of highly effective homing-drives.

323 In conclusion, our results demonstrate a novel factor affecting homing-drive efficiency.
324 We show that heterology between a homing-drive’s flanking regions and those sequences
325 flanking the target allele cut-site can significantly reduce that drive’s performance. A
326 critical question is to what extent this effect could impact homing-drive performance in the
327 real-world. In most cases it should be assumed that homing-drives could encounter
328 significant levels of sequence variation upon release, at least equal to the variation
329 observed within our inbred laboratory strains, particularly in continental areas where most

330 gene-drive deployments will likely occur. A caveat here is that the nature and distribution
331 of this heterology will itself vary and not necessarily be represented by that we observed
332 here. In our system we were only able to contrast and compare those pre-existing 'natural'
333 *kmo* alleles present. Here, even the most divergent *kmo* allele tested was still able to be
334 targeted for Cas9 cleavage and successfully converted to carry the homing-drive, albeit
335 at a significantly reduced rate. If the percentage reduction in homing efficiency observed
336 here were to translate to released strains, however, this could indeed substantially
337 impede their spread through a target population (Supplementary Figure 4), with the
338 magnitude of this effect of course dependent on the identity and frequency of
339 heterogenous target alleles in the wild population. A potentially serious and related issue
340 is the generation of novel drive-resistant alleles: in our system, while sequence heterology
341 impaired the gene-drive's ability to home, it did not impair its ability to cut. As such, a drive
342 introduced into a wild population which shows substantial heterology may produce drive-
343 resistance alleles via end-joining pathways at a substantially higher rate than predicted
344 under lab conditions. While naturally high homing rates may mitigate this effect, for the
345 vast majority of species which have been tested so far, reported homing rates are modest
346 (Grunwald et al., 2019; Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023; Li et al., 2020; Meccariello et al.,
347 2024; Yadav et al., 2023) and thus they may be, to a degree, affected by this mechanism.
348 Prior knowledge of these effects for a given species, homing-drive locus and target
349 population may allow future release programs to preempt adverse consequences on
350 project outcomes, e.g. by increasing release rates accordingly to counteract predicted
351 lower drive efficiency, or by introducing the homing-drive construct into a variety of alleles
352 present within a particular targeted population, ahead of releases. Releasing multiple
353 alleles of a gene-drive insertion into a population would also open the opportunity to
354 employ population-level multiplexing strategies, with each of the released drive alleles
355 working to provide resistance management for the others (Edgington et al., 2020).
356 Additionally, our findings highlight the utility of exploring factors which affect homing-drive
357 dynamics and performance in species/model-systems which do not display near-perfect
358 performance. While 'high-performance' homing-drives may be the first in line for field-
359 release, it is precisely their extreme efficiency which may make them less useful for
360 investigating some of the underlying factors which affect the drive mechanism itself.

361 Our results are particularly significant as gene-drives edge ever closer to field application.
362 They suggest that, at least in some cases, homing-drive efficiencies estimated in
363 genetically homogenous lab populations may be unrepresentative of those which would
364 occur in the real-world. While lab-field discrepancies are well known for other parameters
365 relevant to genetic biocontrol, e.g. mating success, longevity or other factors relating to
366 fitness, this is the first study we are aware of which identifies such a disparity related to
367 the homing mechanism itself. This information will be critical in helping to set realistic
368 expectations of these potentially game-changing systems, if and when they enter the
369 field-testing phase.

370

371 **Data Availability**

372 The authors affirm that all data necessary for confirming the conclusions of the article are
373 present within the article, additional information files, figures, and tables. Specifically, all
374 data gathered during and analyzed as part of the two experiments (i.e. inheritance rates
375 of different genotypes, estimation of cutting rates, list of sequenced allele-identities) is
376 available in the two additional information files. Strains and plasmids are available upon
377 request.

378

379 **Author contributions**

380 THS, XF, VG and LA conceived the project. RK, THS and PL contributed to the design of
381 the experiments. THS, RK and PL performed the experiments and contributed to the
382 collection and analysis of data. THS and PL wrote the manuscript. All authors edited the
383 manuscript.

384

385 **Study Funding**

386 This work was supported by strategic funding from the UK Biotechnology and Biological
387 Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) to The Pirbright Institute (BBS/E/I/00007033,
388 BBS/E/I/00007038, and BBS/E/I/00007039).

389

390 **Conflict of Interest**

391 VG is a founder of and has equity interests in Symbol, Inc. and Agragene, Inc., companies
392 that may potentially benefit from the research results described in this manuscript. VG
393 also serves on both the company's Scientific Advisory Board and the Board of Directors
394 of Synbal, Inc. The terms of this arrangement have been reviewed and approved by the
395 University of California, San Diego in accordance with its conflict of interest policies. LA
396 is an advisor to, and has financial or equity interest in, Synvect Inc. and Biocentis Ltd.,
397 companies operating in the area of genetic control of pest insects. The other authors
398 declare that they have no competing interests

399

400 **References**

401

- 402 Alphey, L. (2014). Genetic control of mosquitoes. *Annual Review of Entomology*, *59*,
403 205–224. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-011613-162002>
- 404 Anderson, M. A. E., Gonzalez, E., Ang, J. X. D., Shackelford, L., Nevard, K., Verkuijl, S.
405 A. N., Edgington, M. P., Harvey-Samuel, T., & Alphey, L. (2023). Closing the gap to
406 effective gene drive in *Aedes aegypti* by exploiting germline regulatory elements.
407 *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), 338. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36029-7>
- 408 Anderson, M. A. E., Gonzalez, E., Edgington, M. P., Ang, J. X. D., Purusothaman, D.-K.,
409 Shackelford, L., Nevard, K., Verkuijl, S. A. N., Harvey-Samuel, T., Leftwich, P. T.,
410 Esvelt, K., & Alphey, L. (2024). A multiplexed, confinable CRISPR/Cas9 gene drive
411 can propagate in caged *Aedes aegypti* populations. *Nature Communications*, *15*(1),
412 729. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44956-2>
- 413 Ang, J. X. De, Nevard, K., Ireland, R., Purusothaman, D.-K., Verkuijl, S. A. N.,
414 Shackelford, L., Gonzalez, E., Anderson, M. A. E., & Alphey, L. (2022).
415 Considerations for homology-based DNA repair in mosquitoes: Impact of sequence
416 heterology and donor template source. *PLOS Genetics*, *18*(2), e1010060.
417 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1010060>
- 418 Burt, A. (2003). Site-specific selfish genes as tools for the control and genetic
419 engineering of natural populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London.*
420 *Series B: Biological Sciences*, *270*(1518), 921–928.
421 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2319>
- 422 Carballar-Lejarazú, R., Dong, Y., Pham, T. B., Tushar, T., Corder, R. M., Mondal, A.,
423 Sánchez C., H. M., Lee, H.-F., Marshall, J. M., Dimopoulos, G., & James, A. A.
424 (2023). Dual effector population modification gene-drive strains of the African
425 malaria mosquitoes, *Anopheles gambiae* and *Anopheles coluzzii*. *Proceedings of*
426 *the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(29).
427 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2221118120>
- 428 Champer, J., Buchman, A., & Akbari, O. S. (2016). Cheating evolution: engineering
429 gene drives to manipulate the fate of wild populations. *Nature Reviews Genetics*,
430 *17*(3), 146–159. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2015.34>
- 431 Champer, J., Wen, Z., Luthra, A., Reeves, R., Chung, J., Liu, C., Lee, Y. L., Liu, J.,
432 Yang, E., Messer, P. W., & Clark, A. G. (2019). CRISPR Gene Drive Efficiency and
433 Resistance Rate Is Highly Heritable with No Common Genetic Loci of Large Effect.
434 *Genetics*, *212*(1), 333–341. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.119.302037>
- 435 Deredec, A., Burt, A., & Godfray, H. C. J. (2008). The Population Genetics of Using
436 Homing Endonuclease Genes in Vector and Pest Management. *Genetics*, *179*(4),
437 2013–2026. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.108.089037>

- 438 Edgington, M. P., Harvey-Samuel, T., & Alphey, L. (2020). Population-level multiplexing:
439 A promising strategy to manage the evolution of resistance against gene drives
440 targeting a neutral locus. *Evolutionary Applications*, 13(8), 1939–1948.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12945>
- 442 Elliott, B., Richardson, C., Winderbaum, J., Nickoloff, J. A., & Jasin, M. (1998). Gene
443 Conversion Tracts from Double-Strand Break Repair in Mammalian Cells.
444 *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, 18(1), 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.18.1.93>
- 445 Esvelt, K. M., Smidler, A. L., Catteruccia, F., & Church, G. M. (2014). Concerning RNA-
446 guided gene drives for the alteration of wild populations. *ELife*, 3.
447 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.03401>
- 448 Gantz, V. M., Jasinskiene, N., Tatarenkova, O., Fazekas, A., Macias, V. M., Bier, E., &
449 James, A. A. (2015). Highly efficient Cas9-mediated gene drive for population
450 modification of the malaria vector mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proceedings of*
451 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(49).
452 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521077112>
- 453 Grunwald, H. A., Gantz, V. M., Poplawski, G., Xu, X.-R. S., Bier, E., & Cooper, K. L.
454 (2019). Super-Mendelian inheritance mediated by CRISPR–Cas9 in the female
455 mouse germline. *Nature*, 566(7742), 105–109. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0875-2)
456 [0875-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0875-2)
- 457 Hammond, A., Galizi, R., Kyrou, K., Simoni, A., Siniscalchi, C., Katsanos, D., Gribble,
458 M., Baker, D., Marois, E., Russell, S., Burt, A., Windbichler, N., Crisanti, A., &
459 Nolan, T. (2016). A CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive system targeting female reproduction
460 in the malaria mosquito vector *Anopheles gambiae*. *Nature Biotechnology*, 34(1),
461 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3439>
- 462 Hammond, A., Karlsson, X., Morianou, I., Kyrou, K., Beaghton, A., Gribble, M., Kranjc,
463 N., Galizi, R., Burt, A., Crisanti, A., & Nolan, T. (2021). Regulating the expression of
464 gene drives is key to increasing their invasive potential and the mitigation of
465 resistance. *PLOS Genetics*, 17(1), e1009321.
466 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1009321>
- 467 Harvey-Samuel, T., Feng, X., Okamoto, E. M., Purusothaman, D.-K., Leftwich, P. T.,
468 Alphey, L., & Gantz, V. M. (2023). CRISPR-based gene drives generate super-
469 Mendelian inheritance in the disease vector *Culex quinquefasciatus*. *Nature*
470 *Communications*, 14(1), 7561. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-41834-1>
- 471 Li, M., Yang, T., Kandul, N. P., Bui, M., Gamez, S., Raban, R., Bennett, J., Sánchez C,
472 H. M., Lanzaro, G. C., Schmidt, H., Lee, Y., Marshall, J. M., & Akbari, O. S. (2020).

- 473 Development of a confinable gene drive system in the human disease vector *Aedes*
474 *aegypti*. *ELife*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.51701>
- 475 López Del Amo, V., Bishop, A. L., Sánchez C., H. M., Bennett, J. B., Feng, X., Marshall,
476 J. M., Bier, E., & Gantz, V. M. (2020a). A transcomplementing gene drive provides
477 a flexible platform for laboratory investigation and potential field deployment. *Nature*
478 *Communications*, 11(1), 352. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13977-7>
- 479 López Del Amo, V., Bishop, A. L., Sánchez C., H. M., Bennett, J. B., Feng, X., Marshall,
480 J. M., Bier, E., & Gantz, V. M. (2020b). A transcomplementing gene drive provides
481 a flexible platform for laboratory investigation and potential field deployment. *Nature*
482 *Communications*, 11(1), 352. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13977-7>
- 483 Mansai, S. P., Kado, T., & Innan, H. (2011). The Rate and Tract Length of Gene
484 Conversion between Duplicated Genes. *Genes*, 2(2), 313–331.
485 <https://doi.org/10.3390/genes2020313>
- 486 Meccariello, A., Hou, S., Davydova, S., Fawcett, J. D., Siddall, A., Leftwich, P. T.,
487 Krsticevic, F., Papathanos, P. A., & Windbichler, N. (2024). Gene drive and genetic
488 sex conversion in the global agricultural pest *Ceratitidis capitata*. *Nature*
489 *Communications*, 15(1), 372. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-44399-1>
- 490 Pescod, P., Bevivino, G., Anthousi, A., Shelton, R., Shepherd, J., Lombardo, F., &
491 Nolan, T. (2023). Measuring the Impact of Genetic Heterogeneity and
492 Chromosomal Inversions on the Efficacy of CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Drives in Different
493 Strains of *Anopheles gambiae*. *The CRISPR Journal*, 6(5), 419–429.
494 <https://doi.org/10.1089/crispr.2023.0029>
- 495 Pescod, P., Bevivino, G., Anthousi, A., Shepherd, J., Shelton, R., Lombardo, F., &
496 Nolan, T. (2024). Homing gene drives can transfer rapidly between *Anopheles*
497 *gambiae* strains with minimal carryover of flanking sequences. *Nature*
498 *Communications*, 15(1), 6846. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-51225-9>
- 499 Purusothaman, D.-K., Shackelford, L., Anderson, M. A. E., Harvey-Samuel, T., &
500 Alphey, L. (2021). CRISPR/Cas-9 mediated knock-in by homology dependent
501 repair in the West Nile Virus vector *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say. *Scientific Reports*,
502 11(1), 14964. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-94065-z>
- 503 Sinkins, S. P., & Gould, F. (2006). Gene drive systems for insect disease vectors.
504 *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 7(6), 427–435. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg1870>
- 505 Terradas, G., Buchman, A. B., Bennett, J. B., Shriner, I., Marshall, J. M., Akbari, O. S.,
506 & Bier, E. (2021). Inherently confinable split-drive systems in *Drosophila*. *Nature*
507 *Communications*, 12(1), 1480. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21771-7>

508 Yadav, A. K., Butler, C., Yamamoto, A., Patil, A. A., Lloyd, A. L., & Scott, M. J. (2023).
509 CRISPR/Cas9-based split homing gene drive targeting *doublesex* for population
510 suppression of the global fruit pest *Drosophila suzukii*. *Proceedings of the National*
511 *Academy of Sciences*, 120(25). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2301525120>

512

513

514 **Figure Legends**

515

516 **Figure 1: Schematic representations of CRISPR-Cas9 based homing gene-drive technologies.** A) A
517 'global' homing gene-drive in which all the molecular components required to initiate the homing reaction
518 are linked and integrated at a single locus in the genome which conforms to the target site of the integrated
519 gRNA. Expression of the Cas9 enzyme and gRNA thus mediates the creation of a double-stranded break
520 (DSB) at the insertion locus on the homologous chromosome. This DSB can be repaired through the
521 Homology-Dependent Repair (HDR) pathway which results in the copying of the gene-drive transgene onto
522 the homologous chromosome. If this process occurs in germline cells, it will result in super-mendelian
523 inheritance of the gene-drive. The efficiency of HDR is dependent on homology between the sequence
524 used as the repair template and the sequences flanking the DSB. These sequences, however, are not
525 always perfectly matched, as shown in the schematic (specifically, γ and θ flanking sequences show
526 heterology). B) Schematic representation of a 'split' homing gene-drive, here where the gRNA-cassette is
527 located within the homing locus (Locus B) as with a global gene-drive design, but the Cas9-cassette is now
528 located at an unlinked, non-homing, location (Locus A). C) The mosquito line crossing scheme for
529 combining the Cas9-transgene and the gRNA-transgene in a split-drive system. In the 'grandparental' F0
530 generation, the two lines are crossed. In the 'parental' F1 generation, individuals carrying both transgenes
531 (trans-heterozygotes) are isolated and crossed to wild type, producing the F2 generation where transgene
532 fluorescence inheritance ratios are recorded in order to estimate homing rates. In this representation, Locus
533 B (i.e. that containing the gRNA cassette, aka the homing element) is coloured in blue, while Locus A (i.e.
534 that containing the Cas9 cassette) is coloured in green.

535

536

537 **Figure 2: Details of the *kmo* locus sequence targeted and genetic background of lines crossed in**
538 **Assay 1 (allele-by-allele approach).** A) Representations of the four *kmo* alleles identified through Sanger
539 sequencing. Allele A was the only allele observed in the 'TPRI' genetic background and showed 100%
540 homology over the sequenced region to the *kmo*-gRNA integrated homing element (0 mismatches over
541 776bp). Alleles B, C and D were the only alleles observed in the 'CA' genetic background and showed
542 varying levels of heterology over the sequenced region to the *kmo*-gRNA integrated homing element. B)
543 Schematic showing how introgression of the two genetic backgrounds allowed investigation of the influence
544 of target allele identity on homing rates. In brief, in the F0 generation, individuals carrying the *Vasa*-Cas9
545 transgene (which resides in the CA genetic background – represented in orange) were first crossed to wild-
546 type individuals possessing a TPRI genetic background (represented in blue). *Vasa*-Cas9 heterozygotes,
547 now in a hybrid CA/TPRI genetic background were then crossed to individuals from the *kmo*-gRNA line
548 (which possesses a TPRI genetic background) (F1 generation). This produced the F2 generation where
549 the *kmo*-gRNA cassette was present opposite all four identified *kmo* alleles, in proportion to their

550 frequencies in the F1 *Vasa-Cas9* heterozygotes. This allowed the homing reaction to take place into four
551 separate target alleles, at the same locus, in a controlled genetic background (shown by curved arrows). In
552 this generation, trans-heterozygotes were crossed to individuals from a *kmo* *-/-* strain (CA genetic
553 background). This produced the F3 generation where, for each egg raft, fluorescence ratios and eye
554 phenotypes were recorded and the target *kmo* allele present in the F2 trans-heterozygote which produced
555 that egg raft identified through PCR.

556

557 **Figure 3: Results from Assay 1 homing crosses:** A) ‘Cutting rates’ estimated for the four identified *kmo*
558 target alleles in the F2 *Vasa-Cas9/kmo*-gRNA trans-heterozygotes. Here cutting was calculated as the sum
559 of NHEJ (signified by white-eye phenotype individuals) and HDR (derived from *kmo*-gRNA inheritance
560 >50%) events observed in the F3 progeny. B) ‘Homing rates’ estimated for the four identified *kmo* target
561 alleles in the F2 *Vasa-Cas9/kmo*-gRNA trans-heterozygotes. Here homing rate was calculated as the % of
562 wild-type alleles converted to bear the homing-drive cassette in the trans-heterozygote germline (derived
563 from level of *kmo*-gRNA inheritance >50%). As such, a homing rate of 50% would represent half the wild-
564 type alleles in the F2 trans-heterozygote germline being converted to homing-element alleles, and an
565 overall inheritance rate of the *kmo*-gRNA transgene of 75%. For both A) and B) Large symbols and error
566 bars (vertical lines) represent mean and 95% confidence intervals calculated by a generalized linear mixed
567 model with a binomial (‘logit’ link) error distribution, individual points to the right of each estimated mean
568 represent pools of offspring derived from a single female parent. Relative size of the small points is in
569 proportion to the number of individuals recorded for that data point (batch size). C) Raw data values of
570 recorded ‘Homing rates’ as a percentage of the pooled total of ‘Cutting rates’ for each of the four identified
571 *kmo* target alleles. Raw data proportions (C) represent unadjusted observations, while model-estimated
572 means (A&B) account for covariates and random effects.

573

574

575 **Figure 4: Comparison of estimated homing rates from** (Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023) ‘Original’ (i.e.
576 Harvey-Samuel & Feng, 2023) **and Assay 2 (i.e. Generalised approach - this study).** In each case, a
577 full factorial split-drive cross setup was applied (i.e. testing all combinations of grandparental and parental
578 sex on estimated homing rates). Facets separate offspring according to the grandparent and parent from
579 which they inherited the *Vasa-Cas9* transgene. Large symbols and error bars represent mean and 95%
580 confidence intervals, small points represent raw data. Relative size of the small points is in proportion to
581 the number of individuals recorded for this data point (batch size). Annotated asterisks represent pairwise
582 significant difference tests at (n.s. = non-significant, * <0.05, ** <0.01, *** <0.001).

583

1 Title: Sequence mismatch between gene-drive and target-site flanking
2 regions significantly impairs homing efficiency in *Culex quinquefasciatus*.

3

4 **Authors**

5 Harvey-Samuel, T.^{1,2}, Kaur, R.², Leftwich, P.T.³, Feng, X.⁴, Gantz, V.⁵, Alphey, L.^{6,7}

6 ¹ School of Life Sciences, Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire, ST5 5GB, UK

7 ² Arthropod Genetics, The Pirbright Institute, Woking, UK, GU24 0NF, UK

8 ³ School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park,
9 Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK

10 ⁴ Key Laboratory of Biology of Crop Pathogens and Insects of Zhejiang Province, College
11 of Agriculture and Biotechnology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China

12 ⁵ Section of Cell and Developmental Biology, University of California San Diego, San
13 Diego, California, 92093, USA

14 ⁶ Department of Biology, University of York, Wentworth Way, York, YO10 5DD, UK

15 ⁷ York Biomedical Research Institute, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD,
16 UK

17

18 Corresponding author: Luke Alphey: luke.alphey@york.ac.uk

19 Keywords: Homology Directed Repair, gene-drive, Homing Endonuclease Gene, west
20 Nile virus, avian malaria

21 Running Title: Target mismatch impairs homing-drive efficiency

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 **Abstract**

31 CRISPR/Cas9-based homing gene-drives (homing-drives) hold enormous potential as
32 control tools for mosquito disease-vectors. These genomically-encoded technologies
33 spread themselves through target populations by creating double-stranded DNA breaks
34 on homologous chromosomes, into which the homing-drives are copied ('homed').
35 Homing is dependent on sequence homology between the genomic regions flanking the
36 transgene insertion and the break site. Homing efficiency (i.e. copying rate) substantially
37 impacts the power of these systems: less efficient homing-drives spread slower, have
38 fewer applications and are more resistance-prone. Understanding what influences
39 homing-drive efficiency is therefore vital to the successful use of these technologies.
40 Here we report a novel mechanism by which a homing-drive's efficiency can be
41 significantly impaired by natural sequence variation within a population into which it is
42 spreading. Using a *kmo*-targeting 'split' homing-drive in the West Nile virus mosquito
43 *Culex quinquefasciatus*, we found that target-site heterology (sequence mismatch
44 between the genomic regions flanking the target cut-site and the homing-drive transgene)
45 of less than 10% reduced homing efficiency by up to 54%. While substantial research
46 effort has been dedicated to increasing homing-drive efficiency through optimisation of
47 within-construct components, our results highlight that the real-world efficacy of these
48 systems may in part depend on variation beyond these controllable factors.

49

50

51 **Article Summary**

52 Homing-based gene-drives are transformative pest control tools. They work by spreading
53 through the gene-pool of a target-pest population, affecting its control. This spreading is
54 achieved by 'homing': where the gene-drive copies itself from one homologous
55 chromosome to another. Homing requires DNA sequences either side (i.e. flanking) the
56 gene-drive to match those of the site it is copying into. Using a homing gene-drive in the
57 mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* we assess how sequence mismatches between these
58 flanking regions affect homing efficiency. We find even small levels of mismatch can
59 significantly reduce homing and discuss this in the context of real-world gene-drive
60 deployment.

61 **Introduction**

62 CRISPR/Cas9 'homing' gene-drives (henceforth homing-drives) are genomically
63 encoded technologies which hold immense promise for controlling intractable pests, with
64 notable development in disease-vectoring mosquitoes (Alphey, 2014; Anderson et al.,
65 2024; Gantz et al., 2015; Hammond et al., 2016; Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023; Li et al.,
66 2020; Sinkins & Gould, 2006). A homing-drive increases its allele frequency from one

67 generation to the next by copying ('homing') itself from one homologous chromosome to
68 another in germline cells (Burt, 2003). For pest management, a homing-drive can be
69 designed to simultaneously spread traits beneficial for control e.g. pathogen
70 refractoriness or a genetic load for population suppression/eradication (Champer et al.,
71 2016). The efficiency of the homing reaction substantially influences the population-level
72 efficacy of a homing-drive: higher homing rates enable faster spread and higher tolerance
73 of drive-associated fitness costs (Deredec et al., 2008).

74 At a molecular level, homing occurs when Cas9 expressed by a homing-drive transgene
75 creates a double-stranded DNA break (henceforth 'cut-site') at a specific sequence on
76 the target chromosome, into which the homing-drive is homed (Esvelt et al., 2014) (Fig
77 1.). Homing is mediated by the homology-directed-repair (HDR) pathway, requiring the
78 genomic sequences flanking the homing-drive transgene insertion-site and the target
79 allele cut-site to show homology. While substantial effort has been devoted to exploring
80 how 'within-drive' components (e.g. regulatory elements for expressing Cas9 (Anderson
81 et al., 2023; Hammond et al., 2021)) affect homing rates, comparatively little attention has
82 been paid to the role of these genomic flanking regions in influencing homing efficiency.
83 This is surprising as the impact of even minor sequence divergence between loci in
84 substantially reducing homologous recombination rates is well established (Elliott et al.,
85 1998). In the real-world, homing-drives will be required to function in genetically diverse
86 'wild' populations, which will likely also include pre-existing heterogeneity around the cut-
87 site. Whether sequence mismatch (henceforth 'heterology') between a homing-drive's
88 flanking genomic regions and those flanking its target allele cut-site influences homing
89 rates is thus of considerable importance.

90 We explored this question using our homing-drive system in the West-Nile-virus vector
91 mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* (Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023). This system consists of
92 a 'split-drive' design where the two homing-drive components (germline-expressing Cas9
93 and gRNA-expressing cassettes) are integrated at independent loci - one of which (here
94 the gRNA-cassette) is in the target allele - and maintained in separate lines (Esvelt et al.,
95 2014). The two lines can then be crossed together to initiate the homing reaction in trans-
96 heterozygotes. By using the *kynurinine 3-monooxygenase* (*kmo*) gene as our target allele
97 (where homozygous null mutations give an easily visualized 'white-eye' phenotype
98 (Purusothaman et al., 2021)) and conducting all comparison crosses in a 'controlled'
99 genetic background, we were able to unambiguously distinguish Cas9-mediated cutting
100 and homing, and attribute variation in these to individual *kmo* target alleles which
101 displayed varying levels of heterology. This experimental design provided unparalleled
102 power to assess this fundamentally important question.

103 **Materials and methods**

104 Ethics

105 Work followed procedures/protocols approved by The Pirbright Institute Biological Agents
106 & Genetic Modification Safety Committee. All homing assays were conducted at The
107 Pirbright Institute IS4L arthropod containment facility under the necessary safety
108 regulations for gene-drive research.

109 Mosquito lines used, rearing and maintenance.

110 The *kmo*-gRNA line was generated previously by integrating a *kmo*-gRNA expression
111 cassette via CRISPR/Cas9 HDR into the *kmo* gene in the TPRI (Tropical Pesticides
112 Research Institute) genetic background. The *kmo* *-/-* line was generated previously by
113 CRISPR/Cas9 knockout of the *kmo* gene in the CA (California) genetic background. The
114 *Vasa*-Cas9 line was generated previously by integrating a Cas9 ORF under the
115 transcriptional control of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* *Vasa* regulatory elements into the *Cardinal*
116 gene in the CA genetic background via CRISPR/Cas9 HDR. The Wild-type (WT) line is
117 the unmodified TPRI line. Rearing/maintenance followed procedures previously reported.

118 Mosquito experiments

119 Assay 1: Allele-by-allele approach

120 Homozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 females were first pool-crossed to WT males, producing
121 heterozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 F1 progeny in a 50:50 TPRI/CA genetic background. Female
122 F1 were then pool-crossed to heterozygous *kmo*-gRNA males to give the F2 generation.
123 Trans-heterozygous *Vasa*-Cas9, *kmo*-gRNA female F2 progeny were then pool-crossed
124 to *kmo**-/-* males and F3 egg-rafts produced individually isolated, with each egg-raft being
125 from an individual female trans-heterozygote. L3-4 stage progeny from each egg-raft
126 were scored for presence of transgenes/eye-pigmentation (white-eyes), as previously
127 demonstrated.

128 Genotyping of target allele (Assay 1 only)

129 After scoring, gDNA was extracted from a single WT or *Vasa*-Cas9 individual from each
130 F3 egg-raft (Machery-Nagel Nucleospin Tissue kit, Düren, Germany). This was used to
131 PCR-genotype the maternally-contributed *kmo* allele (i.e. the allele into which the *kmo*-
132 gRNA had attempted to home in the previous generation). The paternally-contributed *kmo*
133 allele was excluded by designing the reverse primer (PL506) to lie across a region deleted
134 during the generation of the *kmo* *-/-* line. The primers were designed to bind to all 4 *kmo*
135 alleles identified in a preliminary analysis of the strains utilized (A,B,C,D). PCR conditions
136 as follows 98C-1min, (98C-30s, 72C-15s, 72C-1min) x 35, 72C-2min. 200ng of gDNA
137 used per 50ul Q5 PCR Reaction (New England Biolabs). Primers = F(PL303):
138 CCAACATTACCTTCACTTCAACCACAAGC and R(PL506):

139 GTGAGCGTCCTCCCACCGAG. Amplicons extended c.320/540bp
140 upstream/downstream of the cut site – sufficient distance to distinguish the 4 alleles.
141 Reactions were run on a 1% agarose gel and bands extracted using the Machery-nagel
142 Nucleospin Gel and PCR clean-up kit. Purified bands were Sanger sequenced using the
143 forward primer PL303 and sequenced amplicons aligned to the TPRI *kmo* sequence.

144 Calculation of homing and cutting rates (Assay 1 only)

145 Homing rates are defined as the percentage of homologous wild-type chromosomes
146 converted to carry the *kmo*-gRNA transgene (i.e. the percentage of WT alleles which have
147 been affected by homing). It was estimated for each egg-raft as $(200 \times (\text{no. } kmo\text{-gRNA}/\text{total progeny} - 0.5))$. Cutting rate is defined as the percentage of homologous wild-
148 type chromosomes observed as having been cut by Cas9. This includes DSBs that were
149 repaired via HDR (homing), NHEJ (or other error-prone mechanisms) but excludes
150 repairs which resulted in no observable change to the WT allele (perfect repair). It was
151 estimated for each egg-raft as the previously estimated homing rate + $(200 \times (\text{no. non-}$
152 *kmo*-gRNA progeny which showed white-eyes/total progeny - 0.5)). That is, the HDR +
153 error-prone pathway rates.
154

155 Assay 2: Generalising findings

156 Homozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 females were first pool-crossed to WT males, producing
157 heterozygous *Vasa*-Cas9 F1 progeny in a 50:50 TPRI/CA genetic background. This was
158 repeated twice to give F3 *Vasa*-Cas9 progeny in a predominantly TPRI genetic
159 background (c. 87.5% TPRI alleles). Male and female *Vasa*-Cas9 heterozygote F3s were
160 pool-crossed to female and male *kmo*-gRNA line heterozygotes, respectively, giving two
161 cohorts in the F4 generation (one from each of the two F3 crosses). Trans-heterozygous
162 male and female F4 progeny from each of these two crosses were pool-crossed to female
163 and male *kmo* *-/-* individuals, respectively (4 crosses total), and the egg rafts produced
164 individually isolated and scored as for Assay 1.

165 Statistical analysis

166 Homing and cutting rates were both analysed with generalized linear mixed models with
167 a binomial (logit) error distribution. Fixed effects for Assay 1 were the genotyped
168 maternally contributed *kmo* allele with individual female egg-batch as a random effect.
169 Minor overdispersion in the cutting analysis models meant all 95% confidence intervals
170 were checked by semi-parametric bootstrapping (1000 iterations). Results are presented
171 with model-based standard errors and 95% confidence intervals; bootstrap validation
172 confirmed these estimates were robust to minor overdispersion and both summaries are
173 presented in supplementary materials (supplementary tables 1 & 2). For Assay 2 fixed
174 effects included the sex of the Cas9-bearing parent and grandparent as well as whether

175 the data came from the original (i.e. previously published) experiment or post-
176 introgression (i.e. Assay 2). Individual female egg-batches were also included as a
177 random effect. All models and simulations were constructed in R version 4.3.3 with the
178 package lmerTest, model fits were checked with the package DHARMA and model
179 predictions generated with the package emmeans. Data processing and visualization was
180 performed with the tidyverse packages.

181

182 **Results and Discussion**

183 Our aim was to investigate the effect of varying the heterology of sequences flanking the
184 cut-site of a target allele on a homing-drive's homing efficiency. We assessed this at two
185 distinct levels, each specifically designed to give insight into the behavior of this potential
186 effect. Firstly, we took an 'allele-by-allele' approach – assessing a homing-drive's
187 efficiency as it was paired against four different *kmo* target alleles in a controlled genetic
188 background. Secondly, we extended this analysis to a broader range of cross schemes
189 and sexes to assess the generality of findings.

190 1: Allele-by-allele approach

191 In 'split' homing-drives, one of the expression cassettes (here, that expressing the gRNA)
192 is integrated into the target allele at the precise cut-site, forming the 'homing-element'.
193 This can then be combined with the other element, here encoding Cas9, to provide trans-
194 heterozygotes (aka "double heterozygotes") which have one copy each of Cas9 and
195 homing-element and so can catalyse the homing reaction. Furthermore, and crucially for
196 our purpose, in this set-up, the target allele into which a homing-element attempts to home
197 will always come from the line (and therefore the genetic background) which contributed
198 the Cas9 transgene. Preliminary analysis of our highly inbred wild-type (WT) line (in which
199 the *kmo*-gRNA line was generated and is outcrossed to each generation – TPRI genetic
200 background – see methods) and the *Vasa*-Cas9 line (which was generated separately in
201 the CA genetic background – see methods) showed that these two lines possessed highly
202 divergent *kmo* allele sequences. Those carrying the TPRI genetic background contained
203 only a single *kmo* sequence (allele A) which perfectly matched the sequences flanking
204 the integrated *kmo*-gRNA homing-element, while the *Vasa*-Cas9 line contained three
205 different *kmo* allele sequences (alleles B, C and D – back calculated from subsequent
206 genotyping data to be represented at frequencies of 0.15, 0.65 and 0.2, respectively, in
207 that strain) (See figure 2A), each of which showed substantial sequence variation as
208 compared to allele A, especially in the area 5' of the gRNA target site which harbors
209 intronic sequence (See Supplementary Figure 1). We took advantage of this to design an
210 assay in which a Cas9-bearing individual could contribute a variety of target alleles to a
211 homing cross, some but not all of which would match the homing-element flanking
212 sequences but, critically, all of which would end up in the same mixed genetic background

213 (see figure 2B). These female trans-heterozygotes (*kmo*-gRNA/+^{A,B,C or D}, *Vasa-Cas9*/+) were then crossed to male *kmo* -/- homozygotes to allow us to detect both homing (deviation in inheritance rate of homing-element from Mendelian expectation of 50%) and the rate of end-joining (individuals inheriting loss-of-function *kmo* alleles from their mother, generated via Cas9 cutting followed by error-prone repair, will have white eyes but lack the fluorescent marker of the homing-element) in their progeny. This assay showed a highly significant effect of the *kmo* target allele (i.e. A,B,C or D) on homing rate (LRT: $\chi^2_3 = 16.17$, $p = 0.001$), with a 54% difference in estimated homing rates associated with the highest (A = 0.37 [95% CI; 0.31 – 0.42]) and the lowest (D = 0.17 [0.06 – 0.27]) *kmo* target alleles (Figure 3, Supplementary Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary Table 2). Preliminary sequencing confirmed that the gRNA target sequence was present in all four *kmo* alleles and this was confirmed by our comparison of estimated cutting rates (i.e. estimated homing + observed end-joining) between the *kmo* alleles, which did not significantly differ (LRT: $\chi^2_3 = 5.27$, $p = 0.15$; Supplementary Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1, Supplementary Table 2). This suggests that the differences in homing we observed between the four target *kmo* alleles were not simply driven by Cas9 being able to cut some alleles more efficiently than others. Instead, taken together, these data strongly suggest that the mechanism underlying the observed reduction in homing is impairment of homology-directed repair through drive-target allele flanking sequence mismatch. Of note, this effect was observable despite the fact that the vast majority of sequence heterology occurred only on one side (i.e. 5') of the target site. While the nature of available *kmo* alleles did not allow us to investigate heterology structure beyond this, results from *Drosophila melanogaster* 'transcomplementing' homing-drives (López Del Amo et al., 2020a) suggest that the presence of heterologous sequences on both sides of the target site may further impair homing efficiency. Further experiments with a wider variety of *kmo* alleles, or employing target genes with less conservation in coding regions, would enable exploration of the effect of more evenly distributed heterology on homing.

240 2: Generalised approach

241 In the real world, homing-drive transgenes could be inherited from, and be active in, either sex. Previous work has shown that the efficiencies and dynamics of homing-drives can vary dramatically dependent on direction of inheritance (paternal/maternal) in parents and grandparents (e.g. (Anderson et al., 2024; López Del Amo et al., 2020b; Terradas et al., 2021)). As such, we were interested in investigating the extent to which the observed influence of heterology on homing rates was maintained when a wider variety of cross combinations were considered. To achieve this, we first introgressed the *Vasa-Cas9* transgene into the TPRI genetic background by outcrossing *Vasa-Cas9* individuals to our TPRI wild-type line for three consecutive generations. This TPRI introgressed *Vasa-Cas9* line (henceforth *Vasa-Cas9*ⁱ) was then crossed to the *kmo*-gRNA line in a full factorial homing-drive cross (i.e. where the *Vasa-Cas9* and *kmo*-gRNA transgenes were inherited

252 from both grandparental (F0) sexes and the trans-heterozygous (F1) individuals were of
253 either sex) and results compared to our previously published homing analysis of these
254 two transgenes - in that case where the *Vasa-Cas9* transgene was in a pure CA genetic
255 background (Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023). We found that in all like-for-like comparisons
256 the homing rates in this study were higher than in our previous study (aggregate
257 difference 57.8% - 69.3%), only in the male-male crosses was this increase not
258 statistically significant (Figure 4, Supplementary Table 3). This significant interaction
259 between experiment and sex could possibly be indicative of a difference in response to
260 flanking-site heterology between sexes, in the context of homing drives. That is, when
261 faced with high heterology, males showed a higher level of homing than females – an
262 effect which largely disappeared when heterology was decreased (i.e. females increased
263 their homing rates to ‘male’ levels when drive and target-site flanking regions increased
264 in homology). A possible biological explanation for this observation could be a difference
265 in the recognition requirements for engaging HDR in the male and female germlines,
266 however further work would be required to explore this hypothesis. Overall, these results
267 further support our conclusion that target-site/homing-element flanking-sequence
268 heterology can significantly affect homing efficiency.

269 To date, only one other study has directly explored the influence of significant (i.e. >1%)
270 flanking-sequence heterology on homing-drive performance (in *Anopheles gambiae*)
271 (Pescod et al., 2023). In contrast to the results presented here, that study observed no
272 significant influence of target-site heterology on homing-efficacy, despite similar levels of
273 sequence divergence (5.3-6.6% over c.690bp). What might explain the differences
274 between this finding and ours? We propose three non-exclusive possibilities.

275 The first involves the genetic backgrounds in which these crosses were conducted.
276 Pescod *et al.* (Pescod et al., 2023) crossed their homing-drive directly into different
277 geographically distinct *An. gambiae* strains, each of which contained divergent target
278 alleles. As such, each of the different homing-drive/target allele assessments occurred in
279 a distinct genetic background. As it has been shown that (as with ‘natural’ homologous
280 recombination (Mansai et al., 2011)) many loci unlinked to a homing-drive may exert
281 significant influence over homing efficiencies (Champer et al., 2019), this experimental
282 design may have introduced additional variation, potentially obscuring the effects as
283 observed here. We were able to control for these potential epistatic effects by crossing,
284 and therefore partially introgressing, our *Vasa-Cas9* line into the TPRI background prior
285 to homing assays, ensuring each of our *kmo* target allele comparisons occurred within
286 (on average) the same, mixed CA/TPRI genetic background.

287 Secondly, there are potentially species-specific explanations for these contrasting results.
288 Homing-drive efficiencies in *Anopheline* mosquitoes are uniquely high (often approaching
289 or reaching 100%) (e.g. (Carballar-Lejarazú et al., 2023)). The precise reason for this is
290 unknown but could include less stringent requirements on engaging the HDR pathway

291 e.g. higher tolerance to flanking-sequence heterology, or smaller flanking sequences
292 required to initiate homing. Indeed, analysis of homing conversion tract lengths in *An.*
293 *gambiae* (i.e the degree to which the flanking regions of a target allele are converted to
294 carry heterologous sequences contained within the homing-drive flanking regions)
295 showed that (beyond the homing-drive cassette itself) only small sequences are
296 transferred onto the target chromosome (>80% of conversion tracts <50bp) (Pescod et
297 al., 2024). This is substantially shorter than reported for studies considering ‘natural’
298 homologous recombination in other species (typically c. 200bp (Mansai et al., 2011)) and
299 may signify shorter required sequences for RAD51-dependent complementary strand
300 recognition/invasion in *Anopheles*. In contrast, conversion tract lengths in *Aedes aegypti*,
301 another Culicine mosquito, following CRISPR-Cas9 plasmid-based knock-in (also
302 dependent on HDR, though likely occurring in somatic rather than germline cells) were
303 substantially longer (mean of 160bp) (Ang et al., 2022). Interestingly, and in concurrence
304 with our results, that study in *Ae. aegypti* also identified significant negative effects of
305 plasmid/target-site heterology on the efficiency of knock-in. Taken together, these results
306 could suggest that the HDR-pathway in *An. gambiae* is simply less affected by sequence
307 heterology than in other species, including Culicine mosquitoes.

308 Finally, the near-100% homing rates displayed by the drives tested in Pescod *et al* may
309 have made it difficult to observe anything other than extremely large changes (i.e. in this
310 case reductions) in homing, potentially underestimating or missing ‘subtler’ modifiers of
311 homing-efficiency – e.g. those caused by target alleles less amenable to homing. This is
312 because in a homing-drive, inheritance-bias (i.e. the level of homing) is described by odds
313 ($p/(1-p)$) – where p = wild-type allele conversion probability - and the effect of a change
314 in odds on the change in homing rate differs substantially depending on the initial level of
315 homing ((Deredec et al., 2008), concept visualised in Supplementary Figure 3). In
316 essence, for homing-drives which display very high homing-rates, even large changes
317 (e.g. reductions) in odds (*i.e. reductions in the probability of homing*) will have only small
318 effects on the observed levels of homing. This effect is much less pronounced in less
319 efficient homing-drives (i.e. where homing rates are closer to 0), like that demonstrated
320 here. The diminishing return on changes in odds means that, near 100% efficiency, subtle
321 effects on homing may go unnoticed, complicating efforts to accurately evaluate or
322 identify modifiers of highly effective homing-drives.

323 In conclusion, our results demonstrate a novel factor affecting homing-drive efficiency.
324 We show that heterology between a homing-drive’s flanking regions and those sequences
325 flanking the target allele cut-site can significantly reduce that drive’s performance. A
326 critical question is to what extent this effect could impact homing-drive performance in the
327 real-world. In most cases it should be assumed that homing-drives could encounter
328 significant levels of sequence variation upon release, at least equal to the variation
329 observed within our inbred laboratory strains, particularly in continental areas where most

330 gene-drive deployments will likely occur. A caveat here is that the nature and distribution
331 of this heterology will itself vary and not necessarily be represented by that we observed
332 here. In our system we were only able to contrast and compare those pre-existing 'natural'
333 *kmo* alleles present. Here, even the most divergent *kmo* allele tested was still able to be
334 targeted for Cas9 cleavage and successfully converted to carry the homing-drive, albeit
335 at a significantly reduced rate. If the percentage reduction in homing efficiency observed
336 here were to translate to released strains, however, this could indeed substantially
337 impede their spread through a target population (Supplementary Figure 4), with the
338 magnitude of this effect of course dependent on the identity and frequency of
339 heterogenous target alleles in the wild population. A potentially serious and related issue
340 is the generation of novel drive-resistant alleles: in our system, while sequence heterology
341 impaired the gene-drive's ability to home, it did not impair its ability to cut. As such, a drive
342 introduced into a wild population which shows substantial heterology may produce drive-
343 resistance alleles via end-joining pathways at a substantially higher rate than predicted
344 under lab conditions. While naturally high homing rates may mitigate this effect, for the
345 vast majority of species which have been tested so far, reported homing rates are modest
346 (Grunwald et al., 2019; Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023; Li et al., 2020; Meccariello et al.,
347 2024; Yadav et al., 2023) and thus they may be, to a degree, affected by this mechanism.
348 Prior knowledge of these effects for a given species, homing-drive locus and target
349 population may allow future release programs to preempt adverse consequences on
350 project outcomes, e.g. by increasing release rates accordingly to counteract predicted
351 lower drive efficiency, or by introducing the homing-drive construct into a variety of alleles
352 present within a particular targeted population, ahead of releases. Releasing multiple
353 alleles of a gene-drive insertion into a population would also open the opportunity to
354 employ population-level multiplexing strategies, with each of the released drive alleles
355 working to provide resistance management for the others (Edgington et al., 2020).
356 Additionally, our findings highlight the utility of exploring factors which affect homing-drive
357 dynamics and performance in species/model-systems which do not display near-perfect
358 performance. While 'high-performance' homing-drives may be the first in line for field-
359 release, it is precisely their extreme efficiency which may make them less useful for
360 investigating some of the underlying factors which affect the drive mechanism itself.

361 Our results are particularly significant as gene-drives edge ever closer to field application.
362 They suggest that, at least in some cases, homing-drive efficiencies estimated in
363 genetically homogenous lab populations may be unrepresentative of those which would
364 occur in the real-world. While lab-field discrepancies are well known for other parameters
365 relevant to genetic biocontrol, e.g. mating success, longevity or other factors relating to
366 fitness, this is the first study we are aware of which identifies such a disparity related to
367 the homing mechanism itself. This information will be critical in helping to set realistic
368 expectations of these potentially game-changing systems, if and when they enter the
369 field-testing phase.

370

371 **Data Availability**

372 The authors affirm that all data necessary for confirming the conclusions of the article are
373 present within the article, additional information files, figures, and tables. Specifically, all
374 data gathered during and analyzed as part of the two experiments (i.e. inheritance rates
375 of different genotypes, estimation of cutting rates, list of sequenced allele-identities) is
376 available in the two additional information files. Strains and plasmids are available upon
377 request.

378

379 **Author contributions**

380 THS, XF, VG and LA conceived the project. RK, THS and PL contributed to the design of
381 the experiments. THS, RK and PL performed the experiments and contributed to the
382 collection and analysis of data. THS and PL wrote the manuscript. All authors edited the
383 manuscript.

384

385 **Study Funding**

386 This work was supported by strategic funding from the UK Biotechnology and Biological
387 Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) to The Pirbright Institute (BBS/E/I/00007033,
388 BBS/E/I/00007038, and BBS/E/I/00007039).

389

390 **Conflict of Interest**

391 VG is a founder of and has equity interests in Symbol, Inc. and Agragene, Inc., companies
392 that may potentially benefit from the research results described in this manuscript. VG
393 also serves on both the company's Scientific Advisory Board and the Board of Directors
394 of Synbal, Inc. The terms of this arrangement have been reviewed and approved by the
395 University of California, San Diego in accordance with its conflict of interest policies. LA
396 is an advisor to, and has financial or equity interest in, Synvect Inc. and Biocentis Ltd.,
397 companies operating in the area of genetic control of pest insects. The other authors
398 declare that they have no competing interests

399

400 **References**

401

- 402 Alphey, L. (2014). Genetic control of mosquitoes. *Annual Review of Entomology*, *59*,
403 205–224. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-011613-162002>
- 404 Anderson, M. A. E., Gonzalez, E., Ang, J. X. D., Shackelford, L., Nevard, K., Verkuilj, S.
405 A. N., Edgington, M. P., Harvey-Samuel, T., & Alphey, L. (2023). Closing the gap to
406 effective gene drive in *Aedes aegypti* by exploiting germline regulatory elements.
407 *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), 338. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36029-7>
- 408 Anderson, M. A. E., Gonzalez, E., Edgington, M. P., Ang, J. X. D., Purusothaman, D.-K.,
409 Shackelford, L., Nevard, K., Verkuilj, S. A. N., Harvey-Samuel, T., Leftwich, P. T.,
410 Esvelt, K., & Alphey, L. (2024). A multiplexed, confinable CRISPR/Cas9 gene drive
411 can propagate in caged *Aedes aegypti* populations. *Nature Communications*, *15*(1),
412 729. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44956-2>
- 413 Ang, J. X. De, Nevard, K., Ireland, R., Purusothaman, D.-K., Verkuilj, S. A. N.,
414 Shackelford, L., Gonzalez, E., Anderson, M. A. E., & Alphey, L. (2022).
415 Considerations for homology-based DNA repair in mosquitoes: Impact of sequence
416 heterology and donor template source. *PLOS Genetics*, *18*(2), e1010060.
417 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1010060>
- 418 Burt, A. (2003). Site-specific selfish genes as tools for the control and genetic
419 engineering of natural populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London.*
420 *Series B: Biological Sciences*, *270*(1518), 921–928.
421 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2319>
- 422 Carballar-Lejarazú, R., Dong, Y., Pham, T. B., Tushar, T., Corder, R. M., Mondal, A.,
423 Sánchez C., H. M., Lee, H.-F., Marshall, J. M., Dimopoulos, G., & James, A. A.
424 (2023). Dual effector population modification gene-drive strains of the African
425 malaria mosquitoes, *Anopheles gambiae* and *Anopheles coluzzii*. *Proceedings of*
426 *the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(29).
427 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2221118120>
- 428 Champer, J., Buchman, A., & Akbari, O. S. (2016). Cheating evolution: engineering
429 gene drives to manipulate the fate of wild populations. *Nature Reviews Genetics*,
430 *17*(3), 146–159. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2015.34>
- 431 Champer, J., Wen, Z., Luthra, A., Reeves, R., Chung, J., Liu, C., Lee, Y. L., Liu, J.,
432 Yang, E., Messer, P. W., & Clark, A. G. (2019). CRISPR Gene Drive Efficiency and
433 Resistance Rate Is Highly Heritable with No Common Genetic Loci of Large Effect.
434 *Genetics*, *212*(1), 333–341. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.119.302037>
- 435 Deredec, A., Burt, A., & Godfray, H. C. J. (2008). The Population Genetics of Using
436 Homing Endonuclease Genes in Vector and Pest Management. *Genetics*, *179*(4),
437 2013–2026. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.108.089037>

- 438 Edgington, M. P., Harvey-Samuel, T., & Alphey, L. (2020). Population-level multiplexing:
439 A promising strategy to manage the evolution of resistance against gene drives
440 targeting a neutral locus. *Evolutionary Applications*, 13(8), 1939–1948.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12945>
- 442 Elliott, B., Richardson, C., Winderbaum, J., Nickoloff, J. A., & Jasin, M. (1998). Gene
443 Conversion Tracts from Double-Strand Break Repair in Mammalian Cells.
444 *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, 18(1), 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.18.1.93>
- 445 Esvelt, K. M., Smidler, A. L., Catteruccia, F., & Church, G. M. (2014). Concerning RNA-
446 guided gene drives for the alteration of wild populations. *ELife*, 3.
447 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.03401>
- 448 Gantz, V. M., Jasinskiene, N., Tatarenkova, O., Fazekas, A., Macias, V. M., Bier, E., &
449 James, A. A. (2015). Highly efficient Cas9-mediated gene drive for population
450 modification of the malaria vector mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proceedings of*
451 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(49).
452 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521077112>
- 453 Grunwald, H. A., Gantz, V. M., Poplawski, G., Xu, X.-R. S., Bier, E., & Cooper, K. L.
454 (2019). Super-Mendelian inheritance mediated by CRISPR–Cas9 in the female
455 mouse germline. *Nature*, 566(7742), 105–109. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0875-2)
456 [0875-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0875-2)
- 457 Hammond, A., Galizi, R., Kyrou, K., Simoni, A., Siniscalchi, C., Katsanos, D., Gribble,
458 M., Baker, D., Marois, E., Russell, S., Burt, A., Windbichler, N., Crisanti, A., &
459 Nolan, T. (2016). A CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive system targeting female reproduction
460 in the malaria mosquito vector *Anopheles gambiae*. *Nature Biotechnology*, 34(1),
461 78–83. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3439>
- 462 Hammond, A., Karlsson, X., Morianou, I., Kyrou, K., Beaghton, A., Gribble, M., Kranjc,
463 N., Galizi, R., Burt, A., Crisanti, A., & Nolan, T. (2021). Regulating the expression of
464 gene drives is key to increasing their invasive potential and the mitigation of
465 resistance. *PLOS Genetics*, 17(1), e1009321.
466 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1009321>
- 467 Harvey-Samuel, T., Feng, X., Okamoto, E. M., Purusothaman, D.-K., Leftwich, P. T.,
468 Alphey, L., & Gantz, V. M. (2023). CRISPR-based gene drives generate super-
469 Mendelian inheritance in the disease vector *Culex quinquefasciatus*. *Nature*
470 *Communications*, 14(1), 7561. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-41834-1>
- 471 Li, M., Yang, T., Kandul, N. P., Bui, M., Gamez, S., Raban, R., Bennett, J., Sánchez C,
472 H. M., Lanzaro, G. C., Schmidt, H., Lee, Y., Marshall, J. M., & Akbari, O. S. (2020).

- 473 Development of a confinable gene drive system in the human disease vector *Aedes*
474 *aegypti*. *ELife*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.51701>
- 475 López Del Amo, V., Bishop, A. L., Sánchez C., H. M., Bennett, J. B., Feng, X., Marshall,
476 J. M., Bier, E., & Gantz, V. M. (2020a). A transcomplementing gene drive provides
477 a flexible platform for laboratory investigation and potential field deployment. *Nature*
478 *Communications*, 11(1), 352. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13977-7>
- 479 López Del Amo, V., Bishop, A. L., Sánchez C., H. M., Bennett, J. B., Feng, X., Marshall,
480 J. M., Bier, E., & Gantz, V. M. (2020b). A transcomplementing gene drive provides
481 a flexible platform for laboratory investigation and potential field deployment. *Nature*
482 *Communications*, 11(1), 352. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13977-7>
- 483 Mansai, S. P., Kado, T., & Innan, H. (2011). The Rate and Tract Length of Gene
484 Conversion between Duplicated Genes. *Genes*, 2(2), 313–331.
485 <https://doi.org/10.3390/genes2020313>
- 486 Meccariello, A., Hou, S., Davydova, S., Fawcett, J. D., Siddall, A., Leftwich, P. T.,
487 Krsticevic, F., Papathanos, P. A., & Windbichler, N. (2024). Gene drive and genetic
488 sex conversion in the global agricultural pest *Ceratitidis capitata*. *Nature*
489 *Communications*, 15(1), 372. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-44399-1>
- 490 Pescod, P., Bevivino, G., Anthousi, A., Shelton, R., Shepherd, J., Lombardo, F., &
491 Nolan, T. (2023). Measuring the Impact of Genetic Heterogeneity and
492 Chromosomal Inversions on the Efficacy of CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Drives in Different
493 Strains of *Anopheles gambiae*. *The CRISPR Journal*, 6(5), 419–429.
494 <https://doi.org/10.1089/crispr.2023.0029>
- 495 Pescod, P., Bevivino, G., Anthousi, A., Shepherd, J., Shelton, R., Lombardo, F., &
496 Nolan, T. (2024). Homing gene drives can transfer rapidly between *Anopheles*
497 *gambiae* strains with minimal carryover of flanking sequences. *Nature*
498 *Communications*, 15(1), 6846. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-51225-9>
- 499 Purusothaman, D.-K., Shackelford, L., Anderson, M. A. E., Harvey-Samuel, T., &
500 Alphey, L. (2021). CRISPR/Cas-9 mediated knock-in by homology dependent
501 repair in the West Nile Virus vector *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say. *Scientific Reports*,
502 11(1), 14964. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-94065-z>
- 503 Sinkins, S. P., & Gould, F. (2006). Gene drive systems for insect disease vectors.
504 *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 7(6), 427–435. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg1870>
- 505 Terradas, G., Buchman, A. B., Bennett, J. B., Shriner, I., Marshall, J. M., Akbari, O. S.,
506 & Bier, E. (2021). Inherently confinable split-drive systems in *Drosophila*. *Nature*
507 *Communications*, 12(1), 1480. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21771-7>

508 Yadav, A. K., Butler, C., Yamamoto, A., Patil, A. A., Lloyd, A. L., & Scott, M. J. (2023).
509 CRISPR/Cas9-based split homing gene drive targeting *doublesex* for population
510 suppression of the global fruit pest *Drosophila suzukii*. *Proceedings of the National*
511 *Academy of Sciences*, 120(25). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2301525120>

512

513

514 **Figure Legends**

515

516 **Figure 1: Schematic representations of CRISPR-Cas9 based homing gene-drive technologies.** A) A
517 'global' homing gene-drive in which all the molecular components required to initiate the homing reaction
518 are linked and integrated at a single locus in the genome which conforms to the target site of the integrated
519 gRNA. Expression of the Cas9 enzyme and gRNA thus mediates the creation of a double-stranded break
520 (DSB) at the insertion locus on the homologous chromosome. This DSB can be repaired through the
521 Homology-Dependent Repair (HDR) pathway which results in the copying of the gene-drive transgene onto
522 the homologous chromosome. If this process occurs in germline cells, it will result in super-mendelian
523 inheritance of the gene-drive. The efficiency of HDR is dependent on homology between the sequence
524 used as the repair template and the sequences flanking the DSB. These sequences, however, are not
525 always perfectly matched, as shown in the schematic (specifically, γ and θ flanking sequences show
526 heterology). B) Schematic representation of a 'split' homing gene-drive, here where the gRNA-cassette is
527 located within the homing locus (Locus B) as with a global gene-drive design, but the Cas9-cassette is now
528 located at an unlinked, non-homing, location (Locus A). C) The mosquito line crossing scheme for
529 combining the Cas9-transgene and the gRNA-transgene in a split-drive system. In the 'grandparental' F0
530 generation, the two lines are crossed. In the 'parental' F1 generation, individuals carrying both transgenes
531 (trans-heterozygotes) are isolated and crossed to wild type, producing the F2 generation where transgene
532 fluorescence inheritance ratios are recorded in order to estimate homing rates. In this representation, Locus
533 B (i.e. that containing the gRNA cassette, aka the homing element) is coloured in blue, while Locus A (i.e.
534 that containing the Cas9 cassette) is coloured in green.

535

536

537 **Figure 2: Details of the *kmo* locus sequence targeted and genetic background of lines crossed in**
538 **Assay 1 (allele-by-allele approach).** A) Representations of the four *kmo* alleles identified through Sanger
539 sequencing. Allele A was the only allele observed in the 'TPRI' genetic background and showed 100%
540 homology over the sequenced region to the *kmo*-gRNA integrated homing element (0 mismatches over
541 776bp). Alleles B, C and D were the only alleles observed in the 'CA' genetic background and showed
542 varying levels of heterology over the sequenced region to the *kmo*-gRNA integrated homing element. B)
543 Schematic showing how introgression of the two genetic backgrounds allowed investigation of the influence
544 of target allele identity on homing rates. In brief, in the F0 generation, individuals carrying the *Vasa*-Cas9
545 transgene (which resides in the CA genetic background – represented in orange) were first crossed to wild-
546 type individuals possessing a TPRI genetic background (represented in blue). *Vasa*-Cas9 heterozygotes,
547 now in a hybrid CA/TPRI genetic background were then crossed to individuals from the *kmo*-gRNA line
548 (which possesses a TPRI genetic background) (F1 generation). This produced the F2 generation where
549 the *kmo*-gRNA cassette was present opposite all four identified *kmo* alleles, in proportion to their

550 frequencies in the F1 *Vasa*-Cas9 heterozygotes. This allowed the homing reaction to take place into four
551 separate target alleles, at the same locus, in a controlled genetic background (shown by curved arrows). In
552 this generation, trans-heterozygotes were crossed to individuals from a *kmo* *-/-* strain (CA genetic
553 background). This produced the F3 generation where, for each egg raft, fluorescence ratios and eye
554 phenotypes were recorded and the target *kmo* allele present in the F2 trans-heterozygote which produced
555 that egg raft identified through PCR.

556

557 **Figure 3: Results from Assay 1 homing crosses:** A) 'Cutting rates' estimated for the four identified *kmo*
558 target alleles in the F2 *Vasa*-Cas9/*kmo*-gRNA trans-heterozygotes. Here cutting was calculated as the sum
559 of NHEJ (signified by white-eye phenotype individuals) and HDR (derived from *kmo*-gRNA inheritance
560 >50%) events observed in the F3 progeny. B) 'Homing rates' estimated for the four identified *kmo* target
561 alleles in the F2 *Vasa*-Cas9/*kmo*-gRNA trans-heterozygotes. Here homing rate was calculated as the % of
562 wild-type alleles converted to bear the homing-drive cassette in the trans-heterozygote germline (derived
563 from level of *kmo*-gRNA inheritance >50%). As such, a homing rate of 50% would represent half the wild-
564 type alleles in the F2 trans-heterozygote germline being converted to homing-element alleles, and an
565 overall inheritance rate of the *kmo*-gRNA transgene of 75%. For both A) and B) Large symbols and error
566 bars (vertical lines) represent mean and 95% confidence intervals calculated by a generalized linear mixed
567 model with a binomial ('logit' link) error distribution, individual points to the right of each estimated mean
568 represent pools of offspring derived from a single female parent. Relative size of the small points is in
569 proportion to the number of individuals recorded for that data point (batch size). C) Raw data values of
570 recorded 'Homing rates' as a percentage of the pooled total of 'Cutting rates' for each of the four identified
571 *kmo* target alleles. Raw data proportions (C) represent unadjusted observations, while model-estimated
572 means (A&B) account for covariates and random effects.

573

574

575 **Figure 4: Comparison of estimated homing rates from** (Harvey-Samuel et al., 2023) '**Original**' (i.e.
576 **Harvey-Samuel & Feng, 2023)** and **Assay 2 (i.e. Generalised approach - this study)**. In each case, a
577 full factorial split-drive cross setup was applied (i.e. testing all combinations of grandparental and parental
578 sex on estimated homing rates). Facets separate offspring according to the grandparent and parent from
579 which they inherited the *Vasa*-Cas9 transgene. Large symbols and error bars represent mean and 95%
580 confidence intervals, small points represent raw data. Relative size of the small points is in proportion to
581 the number of individuals recorded for this data point (batch size). Annotated asterisks represent pairwise
582 significant difference tests at (n.s. = non-significant, * <0.05, ** <0.01, *** <0.001).

583

This data sheet shows the scored larval phenotypes for the two fluorophores and white eyes in the resul

Cas9 inherited from Grandparent sex	transgenic parent sex	WT
M	M	11
M	M	22
M	M	27
M	M	13
M	M	24
M	M	5
M	M	14
M	M	20
M	M	12
M	M	2
M	F	3
M	F	7
M	F	35
M	F	5
M	F	20
M	F	0
M	F	23
M	F	1
M	F	13
M	F	5
F	F	7
F	F	15
F	F	9
F	F	18
F	F	21
F	F	18
F	F	9
F	F	16
F	F	9
F	F	8
F	M	14
F	M	18
F	M	7
F	M	18
F	M	11
F	M	10
F	M	10
F	M	21
F	M	4

ts generation of the 'Generalised approach' experiment.

Homing scoring

Homing element	Vasa-cas9	Vasa-cas9 + homing element	
	16	13	16
	27	17	25
	48	17	37
	28	9	12
	40	26	39
	14	6	12
	19	14	20
	29	20	42
	34	11	33
	3	3	6
	2	6	2
	16	14	15
	39	25	43
	43	7	36
	43	21	65
	4	0	1
	45	16	56
	5	2	4
	22	24	23
	8	3	6
	31	10	34
	42	22	44
	47	8	31
	35	9	33
	33	15	32
	44	10	45
	55	12	46
	55	25	64
	49	10	43
	36	15	23
	28	14	38
	43	21	46
	17	8	17
	31	16	28
	45	15	51
	17	11	23
	13	7	9
	36	15	35
	27	6	17

Analysis

sum 'have homing element'	sum total	sum	sum	%
32	56			
52	91			
85	129			
40	62			
79	129			
26	37			
39	67			
71	111			
67	90			
9	14	500	786	0.636132
4	13			
31	52			
82	142			
79	91			
108	149			
5	5			
101	140			
9	12			
45	82			
14	22	478	708	0.675141
65	82			
86	123			
78	95			
68	95			
65	101			
89	117			
101	122			
119	160			
92	111			
59	82	822	1088	0.755515
66	94			
89	128			
34	49			
59	93			
96	122			
40	61			
22	39			
71	107			
44	54	521	747	0.697456

White eye data

Cas9 Grandparent sex	transgenic parent sex	WT	Vasa-cas9	sum
M	M	6	2	
M	M	1	0	
M	M	6	3	
M	M	3	1	
M	M	11	7	
M	M	2	0	
M	M	2	5	
M	M	5	5	
M	M	3	4	
M	M	0	0	39
M	F	0	1	
M	F	5	4	
M	F	10	8	
M	F	5	3	
M	F	7	9	
M	F	0	0	
M	F	8	5	
M	F	1	1	
M	F	7	13	
M	F	3	1	46
F	F	2	3	
F	F	2	6	
F	F	6	5	
F	F	8	4	
F	F	5	4	
F	F	9	5	
F	F	7	6	
F	F	6	8	
F	F	4	10	
F	F	4	10	53
F	M	3	4	
F	M	3	3	
F	M	3	5	
F	M	8	6	
F	M	5	7	
F	M	5	0	
F	M	1	1	
F	M	8	6	
F	M	1	1	37

Final cutting analysis

sum As % WT As%Cas9

% A element WE from original experiment due to deposit

MF 0.054347826

FF 0.038793103

overall cutting rate = homing + cutting, controlled for dep

			%Wt alleles homed	%WT alleles cut
27	0.26	0.198529	MM 28	18.72
			MF 36	20.85093168
			FF 52	15.68992042
			FM 40	19.6460177

45 0.410714 0.381356

61 0.407692 0.448529

33 0.327434 0.257813

tion

osition white eyes (original experiment)

Total % WT alleles edited

46.72

56.85093168

67.68992042

59.6460177

This datasheet shows the results from the individual by individual approach experiment. It calculates

Individual no.	Cas9+homing element	Cas9	homing element	WT
45	4	2	0	0
65	13	8	13	8
42	54	30	40	30
5	4	3	1	0
48	9	7	16	6
46	26	8	22	13
1	10	10	8	4
4	14	13	17	13
17	6	2	0	3
5	44	15	35	16
6	23	14	29	8
12	12	12	16	12
8	10	7	12	7
20	8	1	9	1
9	13	9	10	8
22	16	11	19	6
16	5	5	5	6
11	37	20	33	20
23	13	9	14	6
52	28	4	22	7
37	24	11	32	11
47	18	17	12	12
41	26	11	20	7
36	13	13	4	12
17	12	8	12	11
20	34	14	34	11
19	30	15	33	17
39	23	29	36	25
27	31	13	20	15
24	32	26	41	23
13	40	18	34	22
1	30	14	37	11
16	33	21	44	21
18	40	27	30	22
6	22	30	25	16
48	21	13	18	11
3	15	6	8	6
15	21	6	16	6
12	19	13	22	10
29	42	9	25	13
2	37	16	31	15
6	28	8	28	14
9	53	30	36	23
18	5	5	6	2
14	16	13	9	14

	17	11	7	20	8
	27	21	13	26	6
	20	32	23	32	21
	21	39	20	35	20
	23	18	8	19	9
	28	43	28	36	35
	30	42	24	35	26
	37	20	25	22	12
	36	33	13	29	15
	8	53	11	55	18
y		17	3	9	4
x		16	11	8	7
	41	42	27	46	26
	13	35	7	44	8
	33	35	12	26	19
	40	31	30	31	21
	24	17	16	28	10
	31	30	23	31	21
	35	4	9	9	9
	10	31	26	28	20
	7	29	27	36	24
	43	14	8	16	8

homing rates for individual egg rafts (mating events) and connects these with the KMO genotype of

homing rate	Allele type (NA = sequencing failed)	average ho
0.666666667	NA	
0.619047619	C	
0.61038961	C	A
0.625	C	average 0.667919
0.657894737	C	SE 0.019102
0.695652174	A	std dev 0.097402
0.5625	B	sample size 26
0.543859649	C	CI 0.037439
0.545454545	C	
0.718181818	A	
0.702702703	C	
0.538461538	A	
0.611111111	C	
0.894736842	NA	
0.575	A	
0.673076923	C	
0.476190476	A	
0.636363636	B	
0.642857143	C	
0.819672131	NA	
0.717948718	A	
0.508474576	NA	
0.71875	A	
0.404761905	A	
0.558139535	NA	
0.731182796	C	
0.663157895	A	
0.522123894	B	
0.64556962	A	
0.598360656	C	
0.649122807	D	
0.72826087	A	
0.647058824	NA	
0.588235294	D	
0.505376344	C	
0.619047619	A	
0.657142857	A	
0.755102041	A	
0.640625	B	
0.752808989	A	
0.686868687	A	
0.717948718	A	
0.626760563	D	
0.611111111	C	
0.480769231	C	

0.673913043 A
0.712121212 A
0.592592593 C
0.649122807 NA
0.685185185 C
0.556338028 D
0.606299213 C
0.53164557 C
0.688888889 C
0.788321168 A
0.787878788 A
0.571428571 A
0.624113475 A
0.840425532 A
0.663043478 A
0.548672566 C
0.633802817 A
0.580952381 D
0.419354839 D
0.561904762 D
0.560344828 B
0.652173913 NA

the target allele in that cross by sequencing

ming

B	C	D
0.584391	0.61007	0.568953
0.023236	0.014586	0.027977
0.051957	0.066842	0.074019
5	21	7
0.045541	0.028588	0.054833