

Review

Not peer-reviewed version

The Overlooked Impact of Botanical Pesticides on Non-Target Organisms

Ana Paula Soares , [Guilherme Juliao Zocolo](#) , [Adeney de Freitas Bueno](#) *

Posted Date: 22 January 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202601.1708.v1

Keywords: bioinputs; plant-derived compounds; risk assessment; ecotoxicology; essential oils; nanotechnology



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Review

The Overlooked Impact of Botanical Pesticides on Non-Target Organisms

Ana Paula Soares ¹, Guilherme Julião Zocolo ² and Adeney de Freitas Bueno ^{3,*}

¹ Federal University of Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

² Londrina State University, Londrina, Paraná, Brazil

³ Federal University of Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

* Correspondence: adeney.bueno@embrapa.br

Abstract

Aiming to better understand how botanical products affect non-target organisms, the present work reviews current literature focusing on the toxicity of botanical pesticides to organisms other than targeted pests, in order to trace a panorama on the future of sustainable agricultural models worldwide, considering the importance of ecotoxicological studies in the development of new pesticides, including the botanical kinds, which are commonly recognized as essentially harmless. The article reviews published works gathered from digital databases and highlights modern tendencies in pest management research and the development of novel bioinputs, while discussing the Brazilian current legislature regarding agricultural innovations and field obstacles. Nanotechnology techniques are discussed as major innovations employed in the pest control field, and their employment in the improvement of botanical pesticides is addressed and explored. In this work we analyze the factors involved in determining the success of botanical products and their importance to the implementation of a more sustainable way to manage crops. The results indicate a significant lack of studies focused on effects of botanical products on non-target organisms, and an increase in studies with nanoformulations.

Keywords: bioinputs; plant-derived compounds; risk assessment; ecotoxicology; essential oils; nanotechnology

1. Introduction

The world is currently going through a major perspective change in agriculture. Sustainability has become a far more important goal than it ever was, and that drives economies to invest in alternatives to outdated pest control techniques that expose the environment to contamination and pose risks to human health [1]. The employment of non-synthetic bioinputs is becoming increasingly popular, especially when coordinated in an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program, that allies many different techniques to diversify strategies of control tailored to specific pest/crop cases [2]. Synthetic pesticides still hold their place in agriculture, but they will no longer control the market in the future and tend to become less of a preference for farmers [3,4]. Their use is justified in strategic applications through sparse periods [5]. Biological control methods are also increasing in popularity, because of their efficacy in managing specific pests with minimal or no side-effects to non-target organisms (NTOs) [2] like natural enemies such as predators and parasitoids [6]. They will come into play in this review, since they are considered NTOs that should be preserved in nature and, consequently, safe pest control strategies that should be prioritized in agriculture [7].

2. Types, Characteristics and Advantages of Botanical Products

Among eco-friendly pest control tools available today, essential oil-based botanical insecticides have been receiving increasing attention [8] due to their considered lower persistence in the

environment [9], faster degradation [10] and lower impact on non-target organisms [11] when compared to most traditional synthetic insecticides [12]. Despite this, xenobiotics like botanical pesticides can lead to lethal and sublethal effects. Lethal effects are related to the organism's death per se, while sublethal effects can derive from both acute and chronic exposures, and affect exposed organism's populations negatively by influencing their physiological and/or behavioral activities [13]. The types of interactions among plants and other organisms in nature are boundless. The effects we naturally observe on the environment among these organisms merely hint at the potential that can be explored and manipulated by science. Natural insecticidal or insect-attractant plants illustrate the many different techniques nature can employ: the use of dual ecosystem services with bioinsecticidal source plants coupled with floral resources for beneficial species has demonstrated support for natural enemies and the provision of botanical insecticides for pests [5].

Plants like tobacco naturally harbor the ability to deter predators by producing nicotine, a neurotoxin that blocks voltage-gated sodium channels in nerve axons [14]. This interesting mode of action led to the development of neonicotinoids, synthetic substances that act in a similar manner to nicotine. Similarly, pyrethroids were developed as synthetic analogues to a mixture of insecticidal compounds found naturally on the *Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium* (Trevir.) Sch.Bip. flowers. Pyrethroids were developed to overcome the unstable characteristics of natural pyrethrins, such as photodegradation [15,16], but their impact on NTOs is still understudied. Neem-based insecticides are produced from the seeds of *Azadirachta indica* (A. Juss), and are rich in azadirachtin, a terpenoid that shows high insecticidal, repellent, anti-ovipositional and hormone-regulatory properties. Many studies analyze the effects of Neem on insects, and it has been determined to be effective in controlling at least 550 species [16]. Rotenone is also considered an important plant-derived insecticide. This substance is an isoflavonoid extracted from roots and stems of legumes of different species, such as *Tephrosia virginiana* (L.). Rotenone's toxicity to mammals is very high and its lethal dose can be compared to DDT, a synthetic pesticide. Rotenone can act by contact and ingestion, and it can inhibit respiratory enzymes in the cell [16].

Apart from these well-known and well-researched substances, many kinds of plant-derived products can present insecticidal activity, like plant extracts (e.g.: aqueous, dry and oil-based) and essential oils (EOs) [4,17]. These EOs can be used in crude form, generally diluted, but also in blends or mixed into nano/microemulsions [18,19]. A current study explains how most of current research involving the ecotoxicology of plant derived products focuses on commercial and industrial applications. The environmental effects of these products receive much less attention and interest. [17], and according to the authors' review, in a period of 20 years, only 2% of the studies on this subject were published in the environmental sciences category. This could be explained by the common misconception that all natural products tend to be harmless, even though there is substantial evidence to suggest that many plant metabolites can be toxic, posing a great risk to the environment and to human health, albeit less than the more obvious hazards related to their synthetic counterparts [17,20].

3. Botanical Pesticides and Their Impact on Different Kinds of Organisms

Lethal and sublethal impacts of oil-based pesticides on different kinds of non-target organisms have been addressed in extensive reviews [6]. Current reviews evaluate how most studies regarding botanical products ecotoxicity are focused on the aquatic environment, while only 23.5% of all studies focus on effects of these substances on the terrestrial ecosystems, also citing that while EO are commonly believed to only cause toxic effects in very high concentrations, there are cases in which EOs were reportedly toxic at concentrations much below the limit set by international standards and regulations, affecting microalgae, crustaceans and fish. It's important to highlight that while botanical products are generally regarded as eco-friendly, they aren't necessarily always safer than synthetic pesticides and can also be toxic to NTOs of various kinds, which will be explored in the followings, with special attention to insects [17,21].

3.1. Invertebrate Predators

There are many different invertebrate predators of arthropod pests, and they play a great role in biological control techniques. The larger size of these organisms is a factor that makes them less sensitive to the effects of chemical control agents. Different studies show varying results in selectivity of bioactive botanical compounds regarding predators, both generalist and specific kinds. A study has described the side effects of two citrus EO formulations on a generalist insect predator - *Nesidiocoris tenuis* (Reuter) (Heteroptera: Miridae) - that preys on tomato pests, such as *Tuta absoluta* (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). The formulations used were an EO-emulsion and an EO PEG-nanoparticle, developed from 3 different citrus species. The authors found the mandarin EO-based insecticides in both formulations to be the most toxic EO tested against the non-target organism, even residually, after 7 days. The mandarin EO specific composition is shown to be the likely reason for the different results with the other two citrus species used in the study. Interestingly, in this study, the oil that was the least toxic to the NTO was the most toxic to *T. absoluta* eggs and larvae. The results also show that when the NTO was exposed to 3-days-old residues from all test groups, both the emulsions and the EO-nanoparticles resulted in much lower lethality rates when compared to the positive control Indoxacarb (a synthetic pesticide). Even the most lethal of the EO formulations (lemon EO-nanoparticles, with a mortality rate of $9.01\% \pm 3.48$) was comparably less toxic than the Indoxacarb control ($86.96\% \pm 4.07$ mortality). This exemplifies an instance in which an EO can be more selective to the NTO than a synthetic counterpart [22].

EOs can also affect predators in a sub-lethal manner, influencing their life cycle, reproductive performance (disrupting oogenesis, vitellogenesis, maturation and spermatocyte growth) and even their predatory abilities [6]. Voracity is a predatory parameter used to interpret the feeding ability of predators, and studies have shown that it can be positively or negatively impacted with the use of EOs [3,22]. A study demonstrated that a citrus based biopesticide was able to increase the voracity of *N. tenuis*, when compared to a synthetic pyrethroid [23]. Another study demonstrated that *Cymbopogon citratus* (DC. Stapf) EOs and its constituents affected the respiratory rate of *Podisus nigrispinus* (Dallas) (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae), possibly by means of muscle paralysis, which affected predatory ability [24].

A study described how a nano-formulation enhanced the activity of natural pyrethrins against a target insect - *Aphis gossypii* (Glover) (Hemiptera: Aphididae) -, while being harmless to two different non-target predators - the hemipteran *Macrolophus pygmaeus* (Rambur) (Hemiptera: Miridae) and the ladybug *Coccinella septempunctata* (L.) (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). The results showed that pyrethrin had a superior insecticidal effect when encapsulated in the nano-formulations - when compared to commercial pyrethrin concentrates - while also being harmless to the predators. Therefore, nano-formations should be more studied and used in the development of EO-based botanical insecticides as a strategy to increase not only its efficacy against the target pest but also its safety to NTOs. [25]

Some botanically derived substances were also shown to attract natural predators. Studies demonstrated how the green lacewing *Chrysoperla rufilabris* (Burmeister) (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae) and the ladybug *Harmonia axyridis* (Pallas) (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae) preferred to lay eggs on substrates treated with certain EO components, in comparison to untreated controls [6, 26, 27]. It has been demonstrated that *H. axyridis* is attracted to limonene, a substance commonly associated with alarm pheromones in aphids, which can be a chemical cue that guides *H. axyridis* to its prey [27]. Another study revealed an intriguing synergistic mechanism: the spider *Pardosa pseudoannulata* (Boesenberg and Strand) (Araneae: Lycosidae) showed no particular attraction to the EOs of *Piper nigrum* (L.) (Piperaceae) or *Litsea cubeba* (Lour.) Pers. (Lauraceae) when tested individually but was attracted to a mixture of the two. In this experiment, the oils and their mixture were directly applied to *Nephotettix cincticeps* (Uhler) (Hemiptera: Auchenorrhyncha), a leafhopper that serves as prey for *P. pseudoannulata*. This research also clarified that the EOs of *P. nigrum* and *L. cubeba* were determined to be repellent to the pest *N. cincticeps* in previous literature, which further verifies these oils as good candidates for bioinputs [6,28]. This exemplifies how plural the results of testing EOs can be and how

important the compilation of such diverse results is in a review for advancing the scientific knowledge.

3.2. Parasitoids

Literature has established the importance of parasitoids as a biological control agent, regarding their success in the field to their sophisticated and uniquely adapted ways of intercepting hosts, in a stark comparison to the more “crude” mode of action of predators. Despite their efficiency, parasitoids are also highly vulnerable to conventional chemical pesticides, making the development of selective, low-impact alternatives an urgent priority. EOs are promising in this regard, as many formulations can be applied compatibly with the release of natural enemies [3,6].

It is important to draw attention to the fact that the selectivity of EOs to their targets and to specific parasitoids depend largely on factors such as parasitoid species, the type of EO, the host and the parasitoids life instar, and the EO administration techniques. Also, many studies compare the effects of EOs and their major components, and the results vary greatly depending on each case. [6,19,22,29]. For instance, one study demonstrated how EO solutions sprayed upon parasitized eggs can affect adult emergence. According to the authors, some compounds in the EOs can diffuse through the host’s egg chorion and affect the nervous system of the embryo, interrupting its development [30]. Many studies focus on *Trichogramma pretiosum* (Riley) (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae), one of the most widely used and well-studied egg parasitoids in biological control [31]. EOs from *Hyptis marrubioides* (Epling) and *Ocimum basilicum* (L.) were demonstrated to be toxic to *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J.E.Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) when applied topically, yet harmless to *T. pretiosum*, indicating strong potential for integration into IPM programs and reinforcing previous evidence of *H. marrubioides* EO effectiveness against *S. frugiperda* via ingestion essays [32].

A meta-analysis review was conducted focusing on the effects of different botanical insecticides (such as Neem) on hymenopteran parasitoids and found that these products often increased mortality and reduced parasitism and emergence. However, the magnitude of these effects can vary with plant source, parasitoid family, and exposure type. For example, parasitoids in the families Scelionidae and Ichneumonidae were far less affected than those in the other families examined, likely due to differences in detoxification capacity. Negative effects perceived on parasitoid survival were most pronounced in ingestion and residual assays, whereas topical exposure resulted in fewer detrimental outcomes. These findings highlight the need for case-specific assessments to identify application strategies that maximize pest control while protecting biological control agents, establishing the best strategy to use those botanical insecticides efficiently and cautiously [29].

A study evaluated the potential of *C. citratus* (DC.) Stapf EO for controlling *S. frugiperda* and its selectivity towards the egg parasitoids *T. pretiosum* and *Telenomus remus* (Nixon) (Hymenoptera: Scelionidae). Fumigation assays showed high mortality rates for *S. frugiperda* larvae and *T. pretiosum* adults (over 90%), whereas *T. remus* exhibited much lower mortality (12–38%), highlighting how EOs can elicit species-specific responses, and the importance of selecting compatible parasitoid–EO combinations in IPM [33].

Similarly, a study assessed the toxicity of EOs from 3 *Baccharis* sp. species against *S. frugiperda*, through topical and ingestion exposure, and the EOs’ selectivity to *T. remus*, across different developmental stages. Their findings showed pronounced chemical and biological variations among species of *Baccharis* sp.: the oils induced neurotoxicity and lipid peroxidation in *S. frugiperda*, while two *Baccharis* EOs caused no mortality in *T. remus* eggs or pupae, despite exhibiting strong repellency. These studies demonstrate how chemical divergence among closely related plant species can configure EO selectivity, reinforcing the potential of botanical bioinputs as sustainable alternatives to synthetic pesticides when carefully matched to compatible NTOs [34].

A study tested the selectivity of three EOs - *Lippia origanoides* (Kunth), *Cymbopogon winterianus* (Jowitt), and *C. citratus* to the egg parasitoid *T. pretiosum*. All oils tested showed selectivity to *T. pretiosum* at different concentrations, with *L. origanoides* being considered the least harmful of the

three, and the other oils being considered slightly harmful. However, this work also demonstrated that spraying *S. frugiperda* eggs with higher oil concentrations reduced parasitism rates and adult emergence of *T. pretiosum*, in an inversely proportional manner. Therefore, negative side-effects to NTOs must be evaluated in relation to the application rate, rather than attributed solely to the EO per se. The authors clarify that the low residual power observed in EOs dispersed in fields greatly reduces their period of insecticidal activity, and aligning the release of biological control agents such as parasitoids to periods either before or after spraying crops with biological products can be critical in determining the success of an IPM program [30].

3.3. Insect Pollinators

Many studies regarding pesticide impacts on pollinators rely heavily on honeybees - *Apis mellifera* (L.) - as study models; a justified choice given their ecological value. However, Brazil alone hosts 2,000 catalogued native bee species [35], making it essential to expand ecotoxicological studies beyond *Apis mellifera* (Hymenoptera: Apidae). by Giunti Pollinators play a crucial role in crop production, and several cases demonstrate that EO considered safe for crops may still be harmful to these insects [6]. Oils from *Corymbia citriodora* (Hook.) K.D.Hill & L.A.S. Johnson and *Artemisia annua* (L), for example, have shown strong insecticidal activity to pests, but also significant toxicity to the stingless pollinator bee *Tetragonisca angustula* (Latreille) (Hymenoptera: Apidae, Meliponinae). Even so, these products aren't disqualified from use in IPM programs; adjusting application timings - such as spraying during non-flowering stages—can greatly reduce pollinator exposure. By understanding the life cycle of different links in the ecosystem chain, we can better employ accurate methods to each of the plant's life stages [36,37].

Conversely, several EOs are shown to be innocuous or even repellent to beneficial bees. *Lippia sidoides* (Cham.) EO and its major compounds caused low toxicity and no motor impairment in contact essays with *Nannotrigona testaceicornis* (Lepeletier) (Hymenoptera: Apidae, Meliponinae), despite repelling the species [38]. Studying such selective interactions can aid the preservation of pollinator communities, since it can boost the development of products particularly tailored to very specific cases, granting better manipulation of the crop systems in favor of the maintenance of beneficial fauna and effective pest control [1,3].

Apis mellifera comprises 80% of all insect pollinators in the world and poses economic importance for the honey and beeswax market. They are sensitive bioindicators of pollutants, heavy metals and pesticides [6,39]. A study shows that this species can be affected by *Lippia gracilis* (Schauer) EO and its isolated major compounds (Melo et al. 2018), which also affected another pollinator, *Polybia micans* (Ducke) (Hymenoptera: Vespidae) [40].

Apart from lethal toxicity, many studies also investigate sublethal effects botanical insecticides can cause in these organisms, such as interference on movement and flight patterns. *A. mellifera* bees walking activity was negatively affected by its exposure to eucalyptus and neem oil. [41]. It can be speculated that botanical pesticides such as the ones based on EOs can impact the physiology of bees by affecting the nervous system. Low concentrations of EOs and its single compounds have been shown to increase acetylcholinesterase and glutathione S-transferase activities [42].

In contrast, studies also demonstrate how certain EOs can be considered safe to different species of bees. The EO of *Persea venosa* (Nees & Mart.) was effective against *Dysdercus peruvianus* (Guerin-Meneville) (Hemiptera: Pyrrhocoridae), while being harmless to both *A. mellifera* and *Partamona helleri* (Frese) (Hymenoptera: Apidae, Meliponini) – a bee species native to Brazil [43]. A plant extract from *Mammea siamensis* (T. Anders) demonstrated potential as a botanical pesticide: the isolated major compound was tested against different non-target organisms, and *A. mellifera* wasn't affected, while other organisms were [44].

Furthermore, some works have also focused on the effects of isolated volatile substance like methyl benzoate, which is found in many different plants. Studies have pointed to this substance's potential repellent and/or attractant activity depending on insect species, its effect on insect behavior, and its documented toxicity to certain insects. Not only was this compound highly effective against

S. frugiperda, but it was also non-toxic to both a pollinator - *Bombus terrestris* (L.) (Hymenoptera: Apidae) - and two natural predators (*C. septempunctata* and *H. axyridis*) [45].

3.4. Aquatic Organisms

The majority of studies focusing on the potential toxicity of plant derived bioinsecticides on non-target organisms are directed towards aquatic invertebrates. *Daphnia magna* (Straus) (Anomopoda: Daphniidae) is a widely used toxicological model [46]. While some EOs — such as the one from *Pimpinella anisum* (L.) show strong larvicidal activity against the mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* (Say) (Diptera: Culicidae), they can also cause high *D. magna* mortality at elevated concentrations, suggesting the need for adjusted doses [47].

There is a scarcity of research evaluating impacts on microalgae, despite their foundational role in aquatic food chains [17]. Toxicity results for nanoparticle-based botanicals are inconsistent and varied: for example, studies with silver-nanoparticle plant extracts show acute toxicity to *D. magna* and other taxa (such as fish, crustaceans and phytoplankton), while other EO-based products appear to be non-toxic to *D. magna* [48,49].

Other NTOs also warrant attention. Pyrethrum-loaded nanoparticles caused hematological alterations and DNA damage in tadpoles of *Lithobates catesbeianus* (Dubois) (Anura: Ranidae) [50]. Conversely, compounds from *Schinus terebinthifolius* (Raddi) proved effective against *Culex pipiens* (L.) (Diptera: Culicidae) while remaining safe for earthworms and the fish species *Gambusia affinis* (Baird and Girard) (Cyprinodontiformes: Poeciliidae) [51].

Given the critical ecological roles of both freshwater and marine ecosystems [52], expanding toxicological studies across different aquatic groups is essential to ensure the safe use of botanical pesticides and maintain ecosystem integrity and biodiversity.

3.5. Soil Invertebrates, Microorganisms and Enzymes

Soil contamination by botanical pesticides is also an important dimension of ecological safety, since many bioindicator organisms live in the soil and impact nutrient cycling and crop productivity [6]. Earthworms, especially *Eisenia fetida* (Savigny) (Opisthoptora: Lumbricidae), are widely used in ecotoxicological assays, and most studies report that EOs pose little to no risk to this species [11]. Even an EO nanoformulation did not seem to affect *E. fetida*, despite increasing target bioactivity when compared to a crude EO [51].

A study demonstrated that a commercial EO-based biopesticide was non-toxic to *E. fetida*, the collembolan *Folsomia candida* (Willem) (Entomobryomorpha: Isotomidae) and the predatory mite *Hypoaspis aculeifer* (Canestrini) (Acari: Laelapidae) [53]. Likewise, another study regarding 18 EOs showed that most of them only showed moderate toxicity against *Proisotoma minuta* (Tullberg) (Entomobryomorpha: Isotomidae), though 3 of those essential oils were strongly toxic [54]. Notably, eucalyptus oil, that was not toxic against *P. minuta*, had been previously shown by the same authors to be highly effective against *Sitophilus oryzae* (L.) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae), reinforcing how EO toxicity can be species-specific.

A different study found that the main compound of *M. siamensis* was harmless to the earthworm *Pheretima peguana* (Rosa) (Opisthoptora: Megascolecidae), whereas the synthetic insecticide methomyl was 50 times more toxic [44]. The plant volatile “methyl benzoate” showed limited soil accumulation and posed no risk to *E. fetida* [45]. Compounds from the Brazilian plant *Schinus terebinthifolius* were also effective against *Culex pipiens* while remaining safe for *E. fetida*: a study tested the EO, its nanoemulsion and isolated monoterpenes. The 3 compounds showed mosquitocidal, repellent and acetylcholinesterase inhibitory activities against the target insect, and were safe toward *E. fetida*. The EO presented more potent bioactivity than each individual isolated terpene, and among all treatments, the nanoemulsion showed the strongest bioactivity against *C. pipiens* [51].

Soil nematodes can be important bioindicators and are often overlooked in pesticide evaluations [55]. These organisms can also show resilience to certain botanical products. Basil EO (*O. basilicum*)

applied along with chitosan as a seed coating did not disrupt nematode taxonomic diversity, even at high concentrations, while still suppressing *Fusarium* sp. infections on seeds [21].

Microbial communities also play central roles in soil health, yet their interactions with botanical pesticides remain understudied. A study investigated the effects of 23 different EOs on 3 beneficial bacteria species commonly used as bioinputs in agriculture (in the form of biostimulants and biocontrol antagonists) and showed that most of the tested EOs were compatible with all the beneficial bacteria, though a few of those EOs (such as oregano oil) exerted inhibitory activity against the bacteria species tested [56]. These insights highlight the need to examine oil composition when predicting microbial selectivity. Another study showed that Citrus EO formulations did not disrupt microbial abundance or enzymatic activity in soil and were shown to not induce oxidative stress in plants [22], unlike many synthetic pesticides [58]. Some EOs can even be used as carbon sources for soil microbiota [57].

Overall, current evidence suggests that botanical products generally exert a limited impact on soil biota, although species-specific responses exist and must be considered. Since soil ecosystems are complex and biologically diverse, conducting targeted ecotoxicological assessments remain essential steps before choosing botanical pesticides for agricultural systems.

3.6. Mammalians

Not many studies focus on the effects of EOs on mammalians, but it is important to explore that area, since mammals – such as humans and other animals – can be indirectly affected by any pesticide, including EO based products [17]. A study evaluated the effects of a larvicide nanoemulsion based on the EO of *Aeollanthus suaveolens* (Mart. ex Spreng) against *Aedes aegypti* (L.) (Diptera: Culicidae), and its potential toxicity against non-target mammals, using mice as models. The authors found that the EO nanoemulsion was effective against the insect target, especially in concentrations over 60ug/mL. The nanoemulsion did not induce significant changes in weight of the heart, liver, lung and kidneys of mice, and the histopathological tests reveal no changes in the heart of the treated animals, but some alterations were observed in the lungs, kidneys and liver. The authors highlight the fact that nanoemulsions can have a particularly pronounced effect on histological tissues, because the small size of particles used in the emulsion favors a rapid absorption by animal tissues and fast metabolism, which corroborate to a toxic effect [59].

A nanoemulsion of the *Croton linearis* (Jacq.) EO was tested for its larvicide activity and toxicity in NTOs. The results demonstrated the nanoemulsion to have a more potent larvicidal effect than the crude EO. They tested for cytotoxicity on non-neoplastic human lung fibroblasts and tested for and hemolytic effects on murine erythrocytes, as well as acute oral toxicity on rats. As results, they found no hemolytic effect, nor cytotoxicity. The animals in the acute toxicity test presented no organ abnormalities and no abnormal behaviors, which suggests that the nanoemulsion can be classified as a nontoxic product and safely used in the field [19].

More studies focusing on mammalian animals/cells/tissues need to be developed to further investigate a vastness of EOs, their main compounds, nanoemulsions and blends. Factors like formulation type, composition, chemical properties and modes of action can greatly influence the toxicity of these products. That is essential to avoid mammal exposure to these substances, and to popularize the use of EOs as matching competitor to synthetic pesticides.

4. An evolutionary and Molecular Perspective on Possible Targets of Botanical Products

Essential oils are classified as “phytochemicals”, i.e., a blend of different types of substances, that may include terpenes (generally constituting the majority), phenylpropanoids, aldehydes, alcohols, esters, ketones, alkanes and polyacetylenes. EOs are stored in different parts of the plant (like roots, flowers, leaves, seeds, fruits), thus, requiring different extraction methods. Among some of the most common are hydrodistillation, steam distillation and cold pressing. Each type of

extraction technique has advantages and disadvantages when it comes to yield, efficiency and substance preservation [6]. The efficacy of EOs against pests varies greatly within the same genus, since different chemotypes are common. This also means effects on non-target species may vary [6]. EOs are products of the secondary metabolism of plants, and their synthesis depends on many variable environmental factors – such as nutrient availability, soil irrigation, sunlight exposure, etc. -, but also genetic factors, considering that related plant species can share the same gene activation and biosynthetic enzymes in metabolic pathways, which grants certain taxonomic value for specific phytochemicals, although their occurrence seems to be linked to particular adaptations in a specific phylogenetic framework [60]. These “secondary metabolites” are so called because they are not directly involved in the plant’s growth and survival and instead play a role in the organism’s adaptation and response to the environment. Certain transcription factors, like the R2R3 MYB domain, have been linked to plant’s peripheral processes and thus, the secondary metabolism [61]. This group of transcription factors is known to regulate plant’s resistance to different pathogens and diseases [62].

The extensive number of phytochemicals found in plants are directly related to their many evolutionary adaptations to environmental stress and the establishment of different ecological interactions, such as the ones with predators and pollinators. In recent years, the focus on research into gene sequencing has been able to elucidate many mechanisms behind the production of these compounds; by describing the evolution of metabolic enzymes and the biosynthetic pathways they play a part in [61].

Maeda and Fernie (2021) postulate that the immense plant chemical repertoire we find today is partially explained by the transformation of core metabolic enzymes (the oldest kinds, prevalent since the beginning of the history of plants). This mechanism is facilitated by gene duplications, which the authors specify are very prevalent in the plant domain [63]. This explains why secondary metabolites are estimated to number between 200000-1 million, in comparison to only 1000 in primary metabolites: the chemical diversity found in secondary metabolites derives from millions of years of evolutionary adaptations through mutations and natural selection [64].

Plant derived products such as EOs and extracts can act selectively on pests by a myriad of reasons regarding evolutionary perspectives and physiological factors, with evidence sustaining the fact that these substances can have lower risks to beneficial NTOs. There can be many differential biochemical reactions, such as a much higher binding affinity of bioactive compounds to a target organism’s key receptors, like GABA and octopamine receptors. Some examples in literature indicate that alternative products based on the EOs of *Syzygium aromaticum* (L.) Merr & L. M. Perry, *Ocotea indecora* (Schott) Mez and *Pectis brevipedunculata* (Gardner) Sch.Bip. target specific receptors on pest targets, while they do not affect the NTOs, for example, by being innocuous to the predatory abilities of beneficial insects or to the feeding of pollinators, which is a good indicator for an environmentally friendly pesticide [5,65–67].

Many insecticides trap voltage-gated ion channels and cause paralysis or tremor effects, like the TRP channels. Some variants of these channels can be absent in honeybees, while being present in many insect pests. This may indicate why some EOs are shown to affect target pests more than bees, for example. Another interesting case discussed by the authors is relative to detoxification enzymes: studies show that certain EOs selectively inhibit AChE (acetylcholinesterase, an enzyme that catalyzes the breakdown of acetylcholine, an important neurotransmitter) activity in target insects, and at the same time do not appear to impair AChE activities in other non-target invertebrates [6].

Other interesting mechanisms are plant derived substances actions on insect growth systems. Some plant components can cause disruption in insect development and growth, affecting molting and metamorphosis. Some targets include the Methoprene-tolerant receptor, the juvenile hormone primary receptor and the ecdysone receptor [6]. Studies demonstrated a developmental delay in *Dysdercus peruvianus* exposed to the EO of *Persea venosa*, while the same EO (and its isolated main compound, beta-caryophyllene) showed selectivity to pollinator bees, with a high survival rate [43].

These studies show different ways in which plant derived substances can have selective effects on target organisms, while sustaining little to no effect on different beneficial organisms.

5. Facing Challenges in the Future of Botanical Insecticides Market: Regulatory Barriers

Many of the modern-day barriers faced by botanical insecticides were already common nearly 3 decades ago: Resource availability, standardization/quality control and regulatory requirements for registration purposes and legality of use. These factors directly impact the availability of botanical insecticides on the market [68]. Considering regulatory requirements, all studies involving genetic information from organisms in the Brazilian national territory are subjected to the law nº 13.123/2015, (which encompasses plants and their bioproducts, among other organisms), regulating access to genetic heritage, protection and access to associated traditional knowledge, and for benefit sharing for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. This law regulates the access to the genetic property of native plants and other organisms commonly used in the research field. The law also implements the need to register activities involving access to genetic material into a nation-wide database through the SisGen system, and the submission of notifications before commercialization of a final product or reproductive material [69].

In Brazil, the Decree No. 10.375 of May 26, 2020, establishes a program of strategic actions that focus on a direct investment of financial resources, and promotion of science, technology and innovation fields. The “National Bioinputs program” encourages the widespread adoption of biological inputs in agriculture, developing a more sustainable approach to the modern agricultural scenario. These so-called “bioinputs” encompass a range of products such as seeds, fertilizers and inoculants, nutrition products for livestock and plants, botanical extracts, biological control organisms for field dispersal, veterinary vaccines, and various other technologies [70]. The establishment of this nationwide program has been essential to spread new technologies in both the national and the international market, reaching even small-scale producers, by bringing innovative products and technical knowledge to family farms focused on organic products, for example, even though this process is still moving at a slow pace, and the program still has to expand bioinputs accessibility and diversity to these very important groups [71].

Considering how botanical pesticides are generally perceived as innocuous and environmentally safe, it is extremely important that national laws and regulations enforce the rigor of academic research focusing on the development and application of new botanical products, to ensure that the impact of these products on non-target organisms is as minimal as possible. The employment of strict nation-wide regulations by health surveillance organs. According to ANVISA’s (National Health Surveillance Agency) online domain, it is established that IBAMA (Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources), MAPA (Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock) and ANVISA work together to guarantee the safety of pesticides in national territory, and ANVISA is directly involved in performing the toxicological assessment of registered products, determining safe guidelines and proper use conditions. Botanical pesticides are fully included in the scope of this legislation, and the proper regulation of their use is imperative in assuring that NTOs are safe from possible harm. These same institutions are responsible for guaranteeing that imported products are either allowed or banned on national territory.

6. Developing Technologies to Boost Botanical Insecticides Competitiveness on the Market

The national organic market is growing increasingly, reflecting a global shift toward sustainable agricultural practices grounded in “green chemistry”. Organic farming systems in Brazil represent a disruptive alternative to conventional agriculture, emphasizing ecological complexity, functional biodiversity, sustainable management, and integration with natural elements [72]. These principles

support healthier production systems and more balanced interactions with the environment, and the increasing demand for sustainable bioinputs is now extending well beyond the organic sector.

Only a few plant species—such as neem and pyrethrum—have been truly extensively studied for their insecticidal properties, while countless other species remain unexplored despite their potential to yield new bioactive compounds for crop protection. The development of botanical pesticides relies heavily on the study of these compounds, and the understanding of their biosynthesis and modes of action [14]. Brazil is the most biodiverse country in the world, home to 15-25% of all plant species, with a very high rate of biological endemism [72]. This fact, allied to national politics encouraging the cataloguing of plants and the sponsorship of more researchers in the field of bioinputs development, constitute a major and pivotal interest area in the development of a more sustainable future.

Commercial EO-based products can contain one or more types of oil, or be a blended mixture of many oils, or even a blend of synthetic substances, such as terpenoids (which can be naturally found on EOs). The synthetic production of bioactive compounds can be more economically viable when compared to the difficulties involved in extracting large amounts of EO. Requiem Prime® is an example of a current insecticide product developed synthetically from a terpenoid blend [73].

The same qualities that make EOs good candidates for sustainable biopesticides are what limit their use on the market. For example, the low toxicity and high biodegradability of these compounds are in favor of the environment, and at the same time this translates into products with short shelf-life [6]. To overcome the problems brought on by the intrinsic properties of EOs, like volatility and quick degradation in natura, modern approaches like the employment of nanotechnology have become extremely popular.

A great concern about the use of EOs as pesticides in agricultural systems is the large amount of biomass needed to yield a small amount of oil, and the frequent disparities in productivity depending on many factors. Some authors regard the differences in EO productivity to factors such as climate, soil composition, geographic location, seasonal variations, part of the plant used, plant age, cycle stage and harvest period. The type of extraction and drying of the material can influence productivity. Thus, to determine if an EO is economically viable – for example, as a botanical pesticide – it's necessary to assess the number of harvests per year, how much final product is yielded and the duration of each harvest period. [59].

Many studies today employ nanotechnology techniques to enhance the properties of natural products, such as the botanically derived. Nanotechnology is a great tool to improve the qualities of natural products, by extending their shelf-life and regulating their release periods after application and can offer a great impact on the value of a potential product. EOs in their crude form are quickly degraded in nature, and nanotechnology techniques can help elaborate products with more stability and market value, diminishing the impacts of photodegradation and volatilization of metabolites and enhancing field performance [74].

There are many examples of nanotechnology-based studies reinforcing the activity of EOs and their metabolites with carrier systems, like nanoencapsulation and microencapsulation studies [74]. A study employed the method of high-energy emulsification of an EO, and showed great results in controlling *Planococcus citri* (Risso) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae) increasing the oil's efficacy, while also being harmless to non-target honeybees [75]. In a study, a Neem gum nanoformulation was found to be successful against two species of moth larvae and pupae [76]. Another work described how pure Neem oil can present a genotoxic effect on soil bacteria and developed a formulation with zein nanoparticles that showed a great potential to encapsulate Neem oil, demonstrating less genotoxic effects to a non-target biomarker organism, showing how nanotechnology can improve a botanical product by overcoming its practical field limitations [77].

Many studies focus on the enhancement of pure EOs through nanoformulations. In one case, a nanoemulsion from *Croton linearis* (Jacq.) that was more effective in controlling mosquito larvae than the pure EO [19]. A study tested a pure EO, its isolated compounds and an EO nanoemulsion, and found that the nanoemulsion yielded the best results against a target pest, while still being harmless

to NTOs. While these examples are promising, this doesn't mean nanoparticles are perfectly clean delivery systems [51], since nanoparticles bioaccumulation in aquatic and terrestrial systems is a topic that still requires attention [78].

The success of botanical pesticides and their market competitiveness rely on their ability to rise above other consolidated products, by offering minimal ecological impact and environmental disruption while sustaining effective pest control results and supporting the conservation of NTOs. EOs can potentially offer specificity on NTOs' selectivity, allowing finer discrimination among beneficial species and pests, and that is a highly valuable feature in today's sustainability-oriented market. Ensuring the safety of NTOs is a foundation of environmentally responsible pest management programs.

However, it's important to stress that EOs and other botanical products safety cannot be assumed; they must be rigorously evaluated by laboratory and field studies, since selectivity to botanical products like EOs varies not only among species, but also across developmental stages and exposure methods. The efficacy of botanical pesticides mustn't compromise the survival of NTOs and the key ecological services they provide, like the natural regulation of pest populations. The selective toxicity of botanical pesticides is a decisive advantage in a sustainable agriculture model, and EO-based products arise as very promising tools for IPM programs, allowing productivity without sacrificing biodiversity, nor health.

7. Conclusions

The development of botanical pesticides involves the cultivation and extraction of plant biomass, and that must be taken into consideration when evaluating if a product is economically viable. Also, the assumption that natural products are inherently benign poses an additional challenge [17]. This misconception needs to be addressed and demystified, since it prevents science from focusing on natural products' potential hazards, resulting in a scarcity of literature in this field, especially when it comes to non-target organisms other than mammals. Therefore, there is a dire need for more research efforts in determining health risks associated with botanical products, even if only to exclude potential dangers. Although research on pesticidal properties of botanically derived has expanded, relatively few studies evaluate their effects on NTOs, and even fewer consider native Brazilian species. The preservation of native species of beneficial NTOs is crucial, and more focused work is needed in this area, aligning the conservational perspective with the agricultural technologies that take part in IPM programs, and ensuring the preservation of key species, many of which are endangered by habitat loss or competition with uncontrolled invasive species [79,80]. Agriculture is a technological and scale-intensive activity, and it demands great changes in natural habitats. The changes in natural conditions impose selective pressure on resident insect populations, potentially leading to emergence of pests. A notable example is *Euschistus heros* (Fabricius) (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae), now a major soybean pest in South America despite its formerly limited neotropical distribution [81].

Collectively, the evidence reviewed here demonstrates that the study of toxicity effects on NTOs needs to be amplified and reproduced for more species, to further advance the development of safer botanical products. The enforcement of current legislation focused on the surveillance of bioinputs in the national market is crucial in determining the quality and safety of products, and that has direct impact on the agricultural scenario. As the trend for sustainable practices in agriculture grows, the popularity of greener products rises, and Brazil's market influence on international economies is deeply related to the national scientific community's ability to keep up with global innovations on sustainable farming. The current Brazilian governmental initiatives such as the National Bioinputs Program are a step forward in the development of a modernized, optimized, sustainable agriculture, but there is still plenty to accomplish in this matter. Continued investment in research capacity and grant programs in biotechnology and innovation fields are vital in this scenario.

In summary, there is more to the future of sustainable agriculture than the discovery of new bioactive compounds. The current biotechnological and chemical innovations in the agricultural

sciences field need to be coupled with an environmentally healthy perspective that expands beyond economic-restricted views and encompasses sustainable trends, and the study of ecotoxicological impacts of bioinputs on NTOs is a reflection of that shift into the future.

Author Contributions: A.P.: investigation, data curation, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing. G.Z.: writing—review and editing, supervision, project administration. A.B.: conceptualization, data curation, project administration, supervision, writing—review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank the reviewers and editorial team, CNPq, University of Paraná and EMBRAPA Soja.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

EO	Essential Oil
CNPq	Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Pesquisa
NTO	Non-Target Organism
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
EMBRAPA	Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária
MAPA	Ministério da Agricultura e Pecuária
ANVISA	Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária
IBAMA	Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis

References

1. Ahmed, N., Alam, M., Saeed, M., Ullah, H., Iqbal, T., Awadh Al-Mutairi, K., ... Salman, M. Botanical Insecticides Are a Non-Toxic Alternative to Conventional Pesticides in the Control of Insects and Pests. In: *Global decline of insects*. El-Shafie, H., Ed.; IntechOpen: London, England, 2022; 198pp. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.94711>
2. Ayilara MS, Adeleke BS, Akinola SA et al. Biopesticides as a promising alternative to synthetic pesticides: a case for microbial pesticides, phytopesticides, and nanobiopesticides. *Front Microbiol* **2023**, *14*, 1-16, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1040901>
3. Costa LTM, Smagghe G, Jumbo, LOV, et al. Selective actions of plant-based biorational insecticides: molecular mechanisms and reduced risks to non-target organisms. *Curr Opin Environ Sci Health* **2025**, *44*, 1-7, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2025.100601>
4. Daraban GM, Hlihor R, Suteu D. Pesticides vs. Biopesticides: From Pest Management to Toxicity and Impacts on the Environment and Human Health. *Toxics* **2023**, *11*, 1-26, <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics11120983>
5. Amoabeng BW, Johnson AC, Gurr GM. Natural enemy enhancement and botanical insecticide source: a review of dual use companion plants. *Appl Entomol Zool* **2019**, *54*, 1–19, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13355-018-00602-0>
6. Giunti G, Benelli G, Palmeri V, et al. Non-target effects of essential oil-based biopesticides for crop protection: Impact on natural enemies, pollinators, and soil invertebrates. *Biol Control* **2022**, *176*, pp. 1-18, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2022.105071>
7. Raguraman S, Kannan M. Non-target Effects of Botanicals on Beneficial Arthropods with Special Reference to *Azadirachta indica*. In: *Advances in Plant Biopesticides*, Singh D, Ed.; Springer, India, 2022; pp. 173–205, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-2006-0_10

8. Damalas CA, Koutroubas SD. Botanical pesticides for eco-friendly pest management: drawbacks and limitations. In: *Pesticides in Crop Production: Physiological and Biochemical Action*, Srivastava PK, Singh VP, Singh A, et al, Eds.; Wiley, Hoboken, 2020; pp. 181–193, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119432241.ch10>
9. Ntalli NG, Spochacz M, Adamski Z. The role of botanical treatments used in apiculture to control arthropod pests. *Apidologie* **2022**, *53*, pp. 1-26, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13592-022-00924-7>
10. Batish DR, Singh HP, Kohli RK, Kaur S. Eucalyptus essential oil as a natural pesticide. *For Ecol Manage* **2008**, *256*, pp. 2166–2174, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2008.08.008>
11. Benelli G, Pavela R, Cianfaglione K et al. Ascaridole-rich essential oil from marsh rosemary (*Ledum palustre*) growing in Poland exerts insecticidal activity on mosquitoes, moths and flies without serious effects on non-target organisms and human cells. *Food Chem Toxicol* **2020**, *138*, pp. 1-10, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2020.111184>
12. Ebadollahi A, Ziaee M, Palla F. Essential oils extracted from different species of the Lamiaceae plant family as prospective bioagents against several detrimental pests. *Molecules* **2020**, *25*, pp. 1-15, <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules25071556>
13. Ribeiro LP, Vendramim JD, Baldin ELL. *Inseticidas botânicos no Brasil: aplicações, potencialidades e perspectivas*; FEALQ: Piracicaba, Brazil, 2023; 652p.
14. Gupta N, Sharma N, Ramniwas S. Botanical Pesticides: Use of Plants in Pest Management. *CGC Int J Contemp Technol Res* **2021**, *4*, 271-275, <https://doi.org/10.46860/cgcijctr.2021.12.31.271>
15. Mužinić V, Želježić D. Non-target toxicity of novel insecticides. *Arh Hig Rada Toksikol* **2018**, *69*, pp. 86–102, <https://doi.org/10.2478/aiht-2018-69-3111>
16. Laxmishree C, Singh N. Botanical pesticides – a major alternative to chemical pesticides: A review. *Int J Life Sci* **2017**, *5*, pp. 722–729. ISSN: 2320-7817
17. Ferraz CA, Palmeira de Oliveira A, Pastorinho MR, et al. Ecotoxicity of plant extracts and essential oils: a review. *Environ Pollut* **2022**, *292*, pp. 1-22, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.118319>
18. Mazzara E, Spinozzi E, Maggi F, et al. Hemp (*Cannabis sativa* cv. Kompolti) essential oil and its nanoemulsion: prospects for insecticide development and impact on non-target microcrustaceans. *Ind Crops Prod* **2023**, *192*, pp. 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2023.117161>
19. Amado JRR, Prada AL, Diaz JG et al. Development, larvicide activity, and toxicity in nontarget species of the *Croton linearis* Jacq essential oil nanoemulsion. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* **2020**, *27*, pp. 9410–9423, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-07608-8>
20. Haddi K, Turchen LM, Jumbo LOV, et al. Rethinking biorational insecticides for the pest management: unintended effects and consequences. *Pest Manag Sci* **2020**, *76*, pp. 2286–2293, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.5837>
21. Catani L, Grassi E, Guidi L, et al. Ecotoxicological assessment of basil essential oil on soil nematode communities. *Environ Pollut* **2025**, *370*, pp. 1-11, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2025.125898>
22. Campolo O, Puglisi I, Barbagallo RN, et al. Side effects of two citrus essential oil formulations on a generalist insect predator, plant and soil enzymatic activities. *Chemosphere* **2020**, *257*, pp. 1-12, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.127252>
23. Soares MA, Campos MR, Passos LC, et al. Botanical insecticide and natural enemies: a potential combination for pest management against *Tuta absoluta*. *J Pest Sci* **2019**, *92*, pp. 1433-1443, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-018-01074-5>
24. Brügger BP, Martínez LC, Plata-Rueda A, et al. Bioactivity of the *Cymbopogon citratus* (Poaceae) essential oil and its terpenoid constituents on the predatory bug, *Podisus nigrispinus* (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae). *Sci Rep* **2019**, *9*, pp. 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-44709-y>
25. Papanikolaou NE, Kalaitzaki A, Karamaouna F, et al. Nano-formulation enhances insecticidal activity of natural pyrethrins against *Aphis gossypii* (Hemiptera: Aphididae) and retains their harmless effect to non-target predators. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* **2018**, *25*, pp. 10243-10249, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-8596-2>
26. Alhmedi A, Haubruge E, Francis F. Identification of limonene as a potential kairomone of the harlequin ladybird *Harmonia axyridis* (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). *Eur J Entomol* **2010**, *107*, pp. 541–548, <https://doi.org/10.14411/eje.2010.062>

27. Kunkel BA, Cottrell TE. Oviposition response of green lacewings (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae) to aphids (Hemiptera: Aphididae) and potential attractants on pecan. *Environ Entomol* **2007**, *36*, pp. 577–583, [https://doi.org/10.1603/0046-225X\(2007\)36\[577:OROGLN\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1603/0046-225X(2007)36[577:OROGLN]2.0.CO;2)
28. Farid IM, Chakira H, Cai W, et al. Effect of some plant essential oils on the orientation and predation capacity of the predatory spider *Pardosa pseudoannulata*. *J Asia-Pac Entomol* **2019**, *22*, pp. 927–932, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aspen.2019.06.015>
29. Monsreal-Ceballos RJ, Ruiz-Sánchez E, Ballina-Gómez HS, et al. Effects of Botanical Insecticides on Hymenopteran Parasitoids: a Meta-analysis Approach. *Neotrop Entomol* **2018**, *47*, pp. 681–688, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13744-017-0580-5>
30. Sombra KES, Pastori PL, Aguiar CVS, et al. Selectivity of essential oils to the egg parasitoid *Trichogramma pretiosum* Riley (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae). *Rev Ciênc Agron* **2022**, *53*, pp. 1–11, <https://doi.org/10.5935/1806-6690.20220022>
31. Consoli FL, Parra JRP, Zucchi LA. *Egg Parasitoids in Agroecosystems with Emphasis on Trichogramma*. Springer: Dordrecht, Netherlands, 2020; pp. 482. ISBN 978-1-4020-9109-4
32. Bibiano CS, Alves DS, Freire BC, et al. Toxicity of essential oils and pure compounds of Lamiaceae species against *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) and their safety for the non-target organism *Trichogramma pretiosum* (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae). *Crop Prot* **2022**, *158*, pp. 106011, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2022.106011>
33. Bomfim JPA, Silva NNP, Silva CB. Compatibility of *Cymbopogon citratus* (DC.) Stapf (Poaceae) essential oil with egg parasitoids for the control of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J.E. Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Phytoparasitica* **2025**, *53*, pp. 1–11, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12600-024-01223-w>
34. Giraldi GT, Zimmermann RC, Amaral W, et al. Toxicity of essential oils from *Baccharis* species on *Spodoptera frugiperda* and their selectivity to the parasitoid *Telenomus remus*. *J Pest Sci* **2025**, *98*, pp. 2247–2263, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-025-01936-9>
35. Pundek I, Gonçalves RB. Bees from Southern Brazil: diversity, floral visitation, and conservation. *Rev Bras Entomol* **2025**, *69*, pp. 1–10, <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9665-RBENT-2024-0094>
36. Ribeiro AV, Castro EC, Lorini L, et al. Selection of an essential oil from *Corymbia* and *Eucalyptus* as potential natural insecticide against *Ascia monuste* (Lepidoptera: Pieridae). *Chemosphere* **2018**, *205*, pp. 541–548. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.04.033>
37. Seixas PTL, Demuner AJ, Alvarenga ES, et al. Bioactivity of essential oils from *Artemisia* against *Diaphania hyalinata* and its selectivity to beneficial insects. *Sci Agric* **2018**, *75*, pp. 519–525, <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-992X-2016-0461>
38. Matos WB, Santos ACC, Lima APS, et al. Potential source of ecofriendly insecticides: Essential oil induces avoidance and cause lower impairment on the activity of a stingless bee than organosynthetic insecticides, in laboratory. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* **2021**, *209*, pp. 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111764>
39. Papa G, Maier R, Durazzo A, et al. The Honey Bee *Apis mellifera*: An Insect at the Interface between Human and Ecosystem Health. *Biology* **2022**, *11*, pp. 1–24, <https://doi.org/10.3390/biology11020233>
40. Melo CR, Picanço MC, Santos AA, et al. Toxicity of essential oils of *Lippia gracilis* chemotypes and their major compounds on *Diaphania hyalinata* and non-target species. *Crop Prot* **2018**, *104*, pp. 47–51, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2017.10.013>
41. Xavier VM, Message D, Picanço MC, et al. Acute toxicity and sublethal effects of botanical insecticides to honey bees. *J Insect Sci* **2015**, *15*, pp. 1–6, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jisesa/iev110>
42. Glavan G, Novak S, Božič J, et al. Comparison of sublethal effects of natural acaricides carvacrol and thymol on honeybees. *Pestic Biochem Physiol* **2020**, *166*, pp. 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pestbp.2020.104567>
43. Esteves RS, Apolinário R, Machado FP, et al. Insecticidal activity evaluation of *Persea venosa* Nees & Mart. essential oil and its nanoemulsion against the cotton stainer bug *Dysdercus peruvianus* (Hemiptera: Pyrrhocoridae) and pollinator bees. *Ind Crops Prod* **2023**, *194*, pp. 115–123, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2023.116348>
44. Issakul K, Jatisatienr A, Pawelzik E, et al. Potential of *Mammea siamensis* as a botanical insecticide: Its efficiency on diamondback moth and side effects on non-target organisms. *J Med Plants Res* **2011**, *5*, pp. 2149–2156, ISSN 1996-0875

45. Zhao R, Wang HH, Gao J, et al. Plant volatile compound methyl benzoate is highly effective against *Spodoptera frugiperda* and safe to non-target organisms as an eco-friendly botanical-insecticide. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* **2022**, *245*, pp. 1-11, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2022.114101>
46. Tkaczyk A, Bownik A, Dudka J, et al. *Daphnia magna* model in the toxicity assessment of pharmaceuticals: A review. *Sci Total Environ* **2021**, *763*, pp. 1-18, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143038>
47. Pavela R. Insecticidal properties of *Pimpinella anisum* essential oils against the *Culex quinquefasciatus* and the non-target organism *Daphnia magna*. *J Asia-Pac Entomol* **2014**, *17*, pp. 287–293, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aspen.2014.02.001>
48. Khoshnamvand M, Hao Z, Fadare OO, et al. Toxicity of biosynthesized silver nanoparticles to aquatic organisms of different trophic levels. *Chemosphere* **2020**, *258*, pp. 1-9, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.127346>
49. Yeguerman CA, Urrutia RI, Jesser EN, et al. Essential oils loaded on polymeric nanoparticles: bioefficacy against economic and medical insect pests and risk evaluation on terrestrial and aquatic non target organisms. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* **2022**, *29*, pp. 71412–71426, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-20848-0>
50. Oliveira CR, Garcia TD, Franco-Belussi L, et al. Pyrethrum extract encapsulated in nanoparticles: Toxicity studies based on genotoxic and hematological effects in bullfrog tadpoles. *Environ Pollut* **2019**, *253*, pp. 1009–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.07.037>
51. Nenaah GE, Almadiy AA, Al-Assiuty BA, et al. The essential oil of *Schinus terebinthifolius* and its nanoemulsion and isolated monoterpenes: investigation of their activity against *Culex pipiens* with insights into the adverse effects on non-target organisms. *Pest Manag Sci* **2022**, *78*, pp. 1035–1047, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6715>
52. Prakash S. Impact of climate change on aquatic ecosystem and its biodiversity: an overview. *Int J New Econ Soc Sci* **2021**, *3*, pp. 49–70, <https://doi.org/10.46505/IJBL.2021.3210>
53. De Santo FB, Niemeyer JC, Sousa JP, et al. Ecotoxicological effects and risk of novaluron-based insecticides and vegetable oil to non-target in-soil organisms. *Chemosphere* **2025**, *385*, pp. 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2025.144544>
54. Lee YH, Park EK, Lee SE. Adverse effect of essential oil fumigation on *Proisotoma minuta* (Collembola: Entomobryoidae). *J Asia-Pac Entomol* **2002**, *5*, pp. 131-133, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1226-8615\(08\)60142-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1226-8615(08)60142-9)
55. Moura GS, Franzener G. Biodiversity of nematodes biological indicators of soil quality in the agroecosystems. *Arq Inst Biol* **2017**, *84*, pp. 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-1657000142015>
56. Muturi EJ, Doll KM, Dunlap CA. Non-target effects of essential oils on selected beneficial bacteria. *J Plant Dis Prot* **2024**, *131*, pp. 57–63, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41348-023-00825-6>
57. Vokou D, Liotiri S. Stimulation of soil microbial activity by essential oils. *Chemoecology* **1999**, *9*, pp. 41–45, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s000490050032>
58. Mishra V, Srivastava L, Mohanty D, et al. Regional crop productivity and physiology affected by pesticide and UV-B irradiation: growth, photosynthetic pigments and antioxidant enzyme responses in cowpea. *Sci Total Environ* **2008**, *407*, pp. 3720-3726, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2008.02.029>
59. Martins RL, Rodrigues ABL, Rabelo ÉM, et al. Development of larvicide nanoemulsion from the essential oil of *Aeollanthus suaveolens* Mart. ex Spreng against *Aedes aegypti*, and its toxicity in non-target organism. *Arab J Chem* **2021**, *14*, pp. 48-58, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arabjc.2021.103148>
60. Wink M. Evolution of secondary metabolites from an ecological and molecular phylogenetic perspective. *Phytochemistry* **2003**, *64*, pp. 3-19, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9422\(03\)00305-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9422(03)00305-5)
61. Grotewold E. Plant metabolic diversity: a regulatory perspective. *Trends Plant Sci* **2005**, *10*, pp. 57-60, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2004.12.009>
62. Yang K, Dong Q, Wu J, et al. Genome-wide analysis of the R2R3-MYB transcription factor gene family expressed in *Juglans regia* under abiotic and biotic stresses. *Ind Crops Prod* **2023**, *198*, pp. 1-18, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2023.116709>
63. Maeda HA, Fernie AR. Evolutionary history of plant metabolism. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* **2021**, *72*, pp. 185–216, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-080620-031054>
64. Fang C, Liu X, Ahmad S, et al. Exploring the diversity of plant metabolism. *Trends Plant Sci* **2019**, *24*, pp. 25–38, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2018.09.003>

65. Toledo PFS, Viteri Jumbo LO, Rezende SM, Haddi K, Silva BA, Mello TS, Della Lucia TMC, Aguiar RWS, Smagghe G, Oliveira EE. Disentangling the ecotoxicological selectivity of clove essential oil against aphids and non-target ladybeetles. *Sci Total Environ* **2020**, *718*, pp. 137328, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137328>.
66. Araújo SH, Mantilla-Afanador JG, Svacina T, Nascimento TF, da Silva Lima A, Camara MBP, Viteri Jumbo LO, dos Santos GR, da Rocha CQ, de Oliveira EE. Contributions of g-Aminobutyric Acid (GABA) receptors for the activities of *Pectis Brevipedunculata* essential oil against *Drosophila suzukii* and pollinator bees. *Plants* **2024**, *13*, pp. 1392, <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants13101392>.
67. Toledo PFS, Ferreira TP, Bastos IMAS, Rezende SM, Viteri, Jumbo LO, Didonet J, Andrade BS, Melo TS, Smagghe G, Oliveira EE, et al.: Essential oil from negramina (*Siparuna guianensis*) plants controls aphids without impairing survival and predatory abilities of non-target ladybeetles. *Environ Pollut* **2019**, *255*, pp. 113153, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113153>
68. Isman MB. Neem and other botanical insecticides: barriers to commercialization. *Phytoparasitica* **1997**, *25*, pp. 339-344, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02981099>
69. Brasil. Lei n. 13.123, de 20 de maio de 2015. Regula o acesso ao patrimônio genético, à proteção e ao acesso ao conhecimento tradicional associado e a repartição de benefícios, e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial da União: Brasília, Brasil, 2015.
70. Brasil. Decreto nº 10.375, de 26 de maio de 2020. Institui o Programa Nacional de Bioinsumos e o Conselho Estratégico do Programa Nacional de Bioinsumos. Diário Oficial da União: Brasília, Brasil, 2020.
71. Oliveira VC, Melo LDF, Melo Júnior JLA, et al. Bioinputs and organic production in Brazil: a study based on the Embrapa's Bioinsumos application. *Pesq Agropec Trop* **2023**, *53*, pp. 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-40632023v5376326>
72. Vidal MC, Amaral DFS, Nogueira JD, et al. Bio-inputs: the construction of a national program for the sustainability of brazilian agribusiness. *Econ Anal Law Rev* **2021**, *12*, pp. 557–574, ISSN: 2178-0587
73. Bayer CropScience Portugal. Requiem Prime – Inseticidas. Available online: <https://www.cropscience.bayer.pt/cpd/inseticidas-bcs-requiem-prime-pt-pt>. Access on 2 december 2025.
74. Isman MB. Botanical Insecticides in the Twenty-First Century – Fulfilling Their Promise? *Annu Rev Entomol* **2020**, *65*, pp. 233–249, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-011019-025010>
75. Modafferi A, Giunti G, Urbaneja A, et al. High-energy emulsification of *Allium sativum* essential oil boosts insecticidal activity against *Planococcus citri* with no risk to honeybees. *J Pest Sci* **2025**, *98*, pp. 337–348, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-024-01800-2>
76. Kamaraj C, Gandhi PR, Elango G, et al. Novel and environmental friendly approach; Impact of Neem (*Azadirachta indica*) gum nano formulation (NGNF) on *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) and *Spodoptera litura* (Fab.). *Int J Biol Macromol* **2018**, *107*, pp. 59–69, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2017.08.145>
77. Pascoli M, Jacques MT, Agarrayua DA, et al. Neem oil based nanopesticide as an environmentally-friendly formulation for applications in sustainable agriculture: An ecotoxicological perspective. *Sci Total Environ* **2019**, *677*, pp. 57–67, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.04.345>
78. Tortella GR, Rubilar O, Durán N, et al. Silver nanoparticles: Toxicity in model organisms as an overview of its hazard for human health and the environment. *J Hazard Mater* **2020**, *390*, pp. 1-21, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121974>
79. Graf LV, Henriques AL, Rodrigues PR, et al. Ecological impact and population status of non-native bees in Curitiba, Brazil. *Rev Bras Entomol* **2020**, *64*, pp. 376-382, <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9665-RBENT-2019-472>
80. Feliciano RD, Schlindwein MN. A poluição biológica e seus riscos para a biodiversidade: espécies exóticas e invasoras no campus da UFSCar de São Carlos. *Rev Bras Multidiscip – ReBraM* **2024**, *27*, pp. 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.25061/2527-2675/ReBraM/2024.v27i1.1592>
81. Zucchi MI, Cordeiro EMG, Wu X, et al. Population Genomics of the Neotropical Brown Stink Bug, *Euschistus heros*: The Most Important Emerging Insect Pest to Soybean in Brazil. *Front Genet* **2019**, *10*, pp. 1-12, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2019.01035>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s)

disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.