



View PDF

[Download full issue](#)

ELSEVIER

animal

Volume 17, Supplement 2, June 2023, 100904



Review: Recent advances in insect-based feeds: from animal farming to the acceptance of consumers and stakeholders

G. Sogari ^a, S. Bellezza Oddon ^b , L. Gasco ^b, A. van Huis ^c,
T. Sprangers ^d, S. Mancini ^e

[Show more](#)

Outline | Add to Mendeley Share Cite

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.animal.2023.100904> [Get rights and content](#) Under a Creative Commons [license](#)

Open access

Highlights

- New alternative and sustainable feeding sources are an important challenge.
- Insects represent an alternative to some currently used feeds.
- The growth performance of animals varies according to the insect inclusion.
- The quality of products could be affected by insect feeds.
- The consumers' perception of products derived from insect-fed animals is important.

Part of special issue

[Selected keynote lectures of the 73rd Annual Meeting of the European Federation of Animal Science \(Porto, Portugal\)](#)

Edited by Carlotta Giromini, Marco Tretola, Laurence Puillet, Mette Herskin, Noemí Castro, Coordinator: Lorenzo E. Hernández-Castellano

[Download full issue](#)

Other articles from this issue

[Review: Fundamentals, limitations and pitfalls on the development...](#)

June 2023

Candido Pomar, Aline Remus

[View PDF](#)

[Review: Diving into the cow hologenome to reduce methane...](#)

June 2023

Oscar Gonzalez-Recio, ..., Aser García-Rodríguez

[FEEDBACK](#) [View PDF](#)

[Review: Effect of essential fatty acids and conjugated linoleic aci...](#)

June 2023

Arash Veshkini, ..., Harald Michael Hammon

[View PDF](#)[View more articles](#) [Recommended articles](#) [Article Metrics](#)

Abstract

The search for new, alternative and sustainable feeding sources, including insects, has become an important challenge on the feed market. In 2017, the European Union (EU) started to allow the use of insect meals as feeds for fish. In addition, in 2021, the EU also authorised the use of insect meal for pig and poultry farming. However, the adoption of insect meal by the European aquaculture sector is still limited, and this is mostly due to the lack of availability of insects and their higher costs than conventional feed ingredients. Thus, the insect-based feed industry is still in its infancy, and its successful development and integration in the food value chain depend on several factors. Among these, the technical feasibility and production of quality products, and acceptance by European consumers and farmers are relevant factors. To address these points, this narrative review describes the state of the art of the potential role of insect-based feeds. The stakeholders' and consumers' perspectives are investigated, along with the effects of insect-based feeds on the production and nutritional values of fish, poultry (meat and eggs), and pork. Indeed, matching the nutritional values of insect products with conventional feeds is one of the future challenges of the insect sector, as their nutritional composition is highly dependent on the rearing substrates, and thus, their use in animal feeding needs to be investigated carefully. Feeding animals with insect-based diets affects their growth performances and the chemical composition of the derived products (fish fillets, meat, and eggs). Whether these effects can be considered positive or negative seems to depend to a great extent on the percentage of insects included in their diets and the chemical composition of the ingredients. The use of insect-based feeds has also shown a potential to improve the nutritional features and values of animal products and even to add new ones. Finally, many of the acceptance studies on the use of insects in feeds have focused mostly on the consumers' perception rather than on industry stakeholders (e.g., farmers). Future research should focus more on the farmers' perceptions on and market analyses of these innovative feeds. Even though it is likely that the upscaling of the insect sector will lead to a decrease in prices and an increase in market availability, it is still critical to understand the potential barriers and drivers for the implementation of insects as feeds from a production point of view.

Citations

Citation Indexes	53
Policy Citations	1

Captures

Mendeley Readers	161
------------------	-----

Mentions

News Mentions



 **FEEDBACK**

[View details](#) 

 **FEEDBACK**



[Previous article](#)

[Next article](#)



Keywords

Implications

Nowadays, one of the greatest societal concerns is the need to increase food production, and to reduce its negative environmental effects, without increasing costs. Insects could provide positive contributions to this agricultural challenge. To take full advantage of the insect's potential, the establishment of information exchange networks, multidisciplinary research funding, and policies related to sustainable development are recommended. Insect-based feeds represent an opportunity, but it is important to consider the production yields, the nutritional value of the products, and the consumers' opinions. The present study considers all the aspects linked to the application of insect-derived products in a market context.

Introduction

The consumption of animal products is increasing, and the causes can be found in the growing global population and in economic growth (OECD and FAO, 2020), along with a change in consumers' preference for more animal-based products (Godfray et al., 2018). In order to satisfy this upward trend, an increment in animal farming, that is, in fish, pig, and poultry farming, is required, and this, in turn, will lead to a substantial rise in the feed demand. Thus, the search for new alternative and sustainable feeding sources has become an important challenge on the feed market and in the overall food supply chain (Sogari et al., 2019).

Today's world compound feed production has been estimated to be just over one billion tonnes annually, with a market value of over US\$ 400 million (IFIF, 2022). The main ingredient used in commercial livestock feeds is feed grains, which include corn, soybeans, sorghum, oats, and barley. About one-third of all the produced cereals is used for feeds (Olugbire et al., 2021). The use of some insect species, such as black soldier fly (*Hermetia illucens* – BSF) and yellow mealworm (*Tenebrio molitor* – YM) in feeds, has been suggested for monogastric animals and for aquafeeds, mainly to replace soy and fish meals (Makkar et al., 2014).

The impact of insect-based feeds on the global feed market is mainly focused on the animal categories that are the lowest production slices.

Although the global feed market accounts for less than 3% of pet food

and only 4% of aquafeeds, these figures are much higher for the insect market: around 50 and 20%, respectively. It has been projected that the insect market will grow from 100000 to half a million tonnes by 2030, with the share of pet food decreasing to 30%, and the share of aquafeed increasing to 40% ([de Jong and Nikolik, 2021](#)). The production of insect feeds, excluding pet food, is only 45.9% of the global feed market, which is divided into 25% for poultry, 16.7% for fish, and 4.2% for pigs ([de Jong and Nikolik, 2021](#)).

Eighty-five percent of the 350 million tonnes of soy produced in 2018 was destined for animal feeds ([Ritchie and Roser, 2022](#)), while the remaining part was used for direct human consumption ([Voora et al., 2020](#)). Although soybeans will continue to be an important commodity for the foreseeable future, the sector faces critical sustainability and social challenges: deforestation, biodiversity loss, excessive use of herbicides, and human rights violations ([Voora et al., 2020](#)). Furthermore, the inclusion of plant proteins in aquafeeds is limited by the presence of anti-nutritional factors, and thus, insects may become an interesting alternative ([Dawood & Koshio, 2020](#)).

Fishmeal is also being replaced by insects. The global production of fishmeal is around five million tonnes and that of fish oil is around 1 million tonnes ([EU, 2021](#)). About 70% of all fishmeal is used in aquafeeds, 22% in pig feeds, and 5% for poultry. Most of the produced fish oil (69%) is used in aquaculture and rarely in animal feeds ([EFFOP, 2019](#)). The share of fishmeal and fish oil obtained from fish residues – a by-product of processing – has been projected to grow above its current share of one-quarter of the overall fishmeal production ([OECD and FAO, 2020](#)). It is known that fishmeal production harms the environment, and causes eutrophication, depletion, and damage to water bodies ([Ghamkhar and Hicks, 2020](#)).

One of the advantages of insects is that they can grow on organic side-streams, thus contributing to a circular economy. For instance, BSF can bioconvert a large range of organic waste to produce nutrient-rich animal feeds ([Surendra et al., 2020](#)). Studies in a highly productive pilot plant have demonstrated that feeding livestock with BSF could be more beneficial than soy meal or fishmeal, if the insects are fed on unutilised side-streams intended for composting or anaerobic digestion ([Smetana et al., 2019](#)). Moreover, yellow mealworm can also be grown on agri-food side-streams and by-products that are sometimes also treated as waste ([Moruzzo et al., 2021](#)).

A great deal of research ([Makkar et al., 2014](#), [Surendra et al., 2020](#)) has focused on how certain side-streams and their composition are able to achieve an optimal rearing substrate for highly nutritional larvae. The

market and environmental-like high potential of insect-based feeds depends to a great extent on the selected diet; therefore, the following criteria need to be considered: the low price of side-stream(s), the insects' performance, the environmental impact of the entire cycle, and the final appropriate nutritional values of the insect-based feeds that are to be employed in livestock or aquatic species rearing (Sogari et al., 2019). An additional factor that should be considered is related to understanding what percentage of conventional protein sources could be replaced by insect products (van Huis et al., 2021). With regard to monetary constraints, a higher price for insect products could be justified, if there were certain health benefits associated with bioactive compounds, such as antimicrobial peptides, medium-chain fatty acids, and chitin in its derivate forms (Borrelli et al., 2021).

Another key question that needs to be answered concerns whether the by-products of insect rearing can be valorised, that is, by turning fat (obtained when an insect product is defatted), chitin, and the left-over substrates into surfactants and biodiesel, plant protection agents, and fertilisers, respectively (Zainol Abidin et al., 2020, Feng et al., 2021, Poveda, 2021). Ultimately, the type of processing will also influence the nutritional value (Meyer-Rochow et al., 2021).

The nutritional value of insects can be manipulated by intervening in the composition of the waste streams or by making sure that certain ingredients are available in the stream. For instance, the accumulation of n-3 fatty acids in the insect larvae used in aquafeeds may be achieved by utilising discarded fish or flaxseed (Barroso et al., 2019, Lawal et al., 2021).

The insect-based feed industry is still in its infancy, and its successful development and integration into the food value chain depend not only on the technical feasibility and environmental benefits but also on whether consumers are willing to accept insect-fed production animals (DiGiacomo and Leury, 2019).

An increasing number of studies have been conducted to assess the acceptability of food insects for humans (Dagevos, 2021); however, only a few of them have focused on the consumer's perception of the use of insects as a meal for pets (Sogari et al., 2022a). Although previous work (e.g., Giotis and Drichoutis, 2021) showed that the attitude towards insects as feeds is more positive than consuming insect-based foods, evaluations of the consumers' perception of insects as feeds across different pet species remain scarce.

The use of processed animal proteins in farmed animal feeds was prohibited in the European Union for almost two decades, because of

the aftermath of the Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy crisis ([European Commission, 2001](#), [EU, 2021](#)). Thus, this 'feed ban' has hindered the dynamics and growth of the insect sector to a great extent. However, over the past few years, the European Commission has authorised the use of insects (processed animal proteins) as feedstuff, first for aquaculture farming in 2017 and then for pigs and poultry in 2021 ([Commission Regulation, 2021](#)).

This narrative review introduces and summarises the results of the studies published during the 2019–2022 period to provide the state of the art on the potential role of insect-derived proteins as a feed source. The article focuses on the perspectives of European consumers and stakeholders, the effects of using insects on the performance of fish, pigs, and poultry, and the quality of the derived products (i.e., meat and eggs).

Insect-based feeds in aquaculture

The perception of consumers and stakeholders

There are several attributes that affect consumers' purchase decisions when buying seafood products ([Ankamah-Yeboah et al., 2018](#)), such as the country of origin, the production method (wild or farmed), and the preservation method (chilled, frozen, canned, smoked, salted, etc.). However, among all of these attributes, the feed source is not considered to be particularly relevant for purchasing choices ([Ankamah-Yeboah et al., 2018](#)).

Because of the importance of finfish production in the southern European area ([Rumbos et al., 2021](#)), most of the recent studies on the acceptance of insect feeds for farmed fish have been conducted in Mediterranean countries, namely Spain, Greece, and Italy. [Baldi et al. \(2021\)](#) recruited a sample of young Italian consumers (18–25 years old) using social networks and then selected only those who consume fish on a regular basis. Their findings showed that the respondents were more open to these innovative products than millennials, and males seemed to be more in favour of insect-fed fish than females. Moreover, the informed participants showed a higher positive attitude towards eating farmed fish fed with insects than those who were not informed. In addition, using a survey distributed to a group of Greek participants in an aquaculture conference, [Rumbos et al. \(2021\)](#) found that the majority of participants (71% of 228) were willing to eat insect-fed fish; whereas, given the minimal information on the topic, 20% of consumers were not sure whether they would consume it or not. The positive attitude was mainly driven by the expectations that the use of insect meal would lead to beneficial aspects in terms of a reduced

insect meal would lead to beneficial aspects, in terms of a reduced burden on wild fish stocks, a lower environmental footprint impact, and – consequently – the improvement of the sustainability of the aquaculture industry.

FEEDBACK

[Giotis and Drichoutis \(2021\)](#) performed another study on Greek consumers (no=451), by recruiting participants using a survey distributed on social media and emailed to a list of subjects from the general population. Their findings suggested that individuals showed higher acceptance rates for the indirect consumption of insects – i.e., a farmed gilt-head (sea) bream that had been fed on an insect-based feed – than for direct entomophagy – i.e., an energy bar with insect protein or a biscuit made with insect flour. Their results showed that 56% of their participants would be willing to pay a premium to purchase gilt-head bream fed with insect-based feeds.

In another survey, [Ferrer Llagostera et al. \(2019\)](#) recruited a sample of Spanish consumers from the Centre for Agro-food Economy and Development. Their findings showed that most of the consumers in their study (no=215) were willing to pay a premium for gilt-head seabream fed with insect meal as they considered it a more sustainable alternative than fish from conventional aquaculture. However, they also found that the consumers indicated a lower perception of the taste of the gilt-head sea bream fed with insects, which was considered to be worse than that of fish fed with traditional feeding systems. This implies that improving the taste of insect-fed fish might have positive effects on the acceptance of consumers.

In France, [Bazoche and Poret \(2020\)](#) investigated the acceptability of farmed trout fed with insect meal instead of fishmeal among a group of consumers (no=327) recruited by a market research company to quota sample for gender and age. In their study, half of the participants received information on the environmentally negative effects of obtaining fishmeal from the by-catch of marine fishing (e.g., according to FAO, a quarter of all fish captured is used to produce feeds) and on the positive impact of insect meal as a viable alternative to fishmeal. Their results suggest that providing this information encouraged the acceptance of this new type of feed to a great extent, compared to the control group (no information). They also reported that males were far readier than females to accept insect-fed fish.

Although the EU authorised the use of insects in fish diets in 2017 ([European Commission, 2017](#)), its adoption by the European aquaculture sector is still limited. A few studies have investigated the reasons for not adopting this new type of alternative feed. For instance, during an aquaculture conference in Greece, a survey was conducted among stakeholders in the aquafeed and aquaculture industry to

among stakeholders in the aquafeed and aquaculture industry to understand the acceptance of integrating insect meal in farmed fish feeds ([Rumbos et al., 2021](#)). The results indicated that six companies out of the nine that were interviewed were willing to include insects in aquafeeds, whereas another two companies did not indicate a preference. Only one company reported that more information was needed to make a choice. Interestingly, none of the stakeholders answered negatively. Moreover, four out of the nine companies indicated that they would be interested in producing or using insect-based feeds in their plants/on their farms. The most important factors identified for this positive attitude were the reduced environmental footprint and the innovation challenge. On the other hand, the issues that affected the decision-making process - albeit to a lesser extent - were a possible effect of the quality of the products and production costs ([Rumbos et al., 2021](#)).

 FEEDBACK

In an Italian study ([Mulazzani et al., 2021](#)), insect meal producers, fish feed producers, and fish farmers - who reared trout and seabass - were interviewed. According to the feed producers, insect meals produced in Europe can be considered to have a good and standardised quality; nevertheless, the cost of such products is still not competitive. The sales price of insect meals is influenced by different factors, such as the production system, the employed substrate, and the country in which the farm is located ([Niyonsaba et al. 2021](#)). Moreover, in some cases, the economic data have not yet been disclosed. A recent review by [Niyonsaba et al. \(2021\)](#), which considered the meals that included YM and BSF larvae, showed that only the sales prices for BSF products were available and that - in Europe - they ranged from €2000 to €5000 per ton in 2019 and 2020.

The International Platform of Insects for Food and Feeds acknowledges, as an aspirational target, that the total production capacity of the European insect sector could even reach 260000 tonnes by 2030 (i.e., as feeds for food-producing animals, but also including other applications) ([IPIFF, 2020a](#)). Moreover, building on the total expected investment of 2.5 billion EUR that will be invested by the mid-2020s, the sector may reach a total turnover of €2 billion per year ([IPIFF, 2020b](#)). Aquafeeds could thus represent the largest market, with a demand of 40% of all the insect meal produced for feeds. By 2030, more than 10% of the fish consumed in the EU (the equivalent of approximately 30 servings for each European) would be derived from fish farms that used insect proteins in their feed formulations ([IPIFF, 2021](#)).

Insect meals in fish diets

The scientific literature on the use of insect meals in aquaculture is wide and varied, and the most frequently tested aquatic species are carnivorous, both for freshwater and saltwater species (e.g., trout, salmon, seabass, tilapia, and largemouth bass). Moreover, most insect meals originate from BSFs, YMs, and – albeit to a lesser extent – houseflies.

Along with the differences in fish and insect species, other important elements could affect the growth performance results and therefore need to be considered – such as the insect development stage, the type of meal (whole or defatted), and the applied treatment method (the inactivation and/or transformation of larvae). All the considered scientific publications tested iso-lipidic and iso-proteic diets, with the exception of a trial conducted on Nile tilapia, in which the diets were only iso-proteic. The use of whole BSF and YM meals with an inclusion level of 18% generated a difference in the performance of rainbow trout and seabass. In other words, given the higher protein use and the more active digestive function, fish fed on YM performed better, in terms of final BW, specific growth rate (**SGR**), and feed conversion ratio (FCR), than those fed on BSFs ([Reyes et al., 2020](#), [Melenchón et al., 2022](#)). The lowest BSF inclusion level (12%) in largemouth bass generated a reduced growth performance, compared to the control diet ([Fischer et al., 2022](#)). Conversely, the inclusion of 20 and 17% of full-fat BSF larva meal in the diets of Atlantic salmon and Nile tilapia, respectively, increased the final BW and kept the FCR equal, when compared to the control diet ([Wachira et al., 2021](#), [Weththasinghe et al., 2021](#)). As reviewed by [Tran et al. \(2022\)](#), in the period covered by their review, HF meal had only been tested in seabass diets and it showed an equal final BW but a higher FCR than YM-based feeds (both included at 20%). Furthermore, the defatted BSF meal seemed to yield a better growth performance in rainbow trout and seabass than the whole one. Specifically, the FCR, feed intake, final BW, and SGR of rainbow trout did not differ for the BSF and YM dietary treatments, in which the insect meal was included at levels of up to 15 and 20%, respectively ([Caimi et al., 2021](#), [Tran et al., 2022](#)). With regard to seabass, meals with 20% of defatted BSF can be employed without any growth performance reduction ([Tran et al., 2022](#)).

In addition to the BSF larval meals, prepupa and pupa meals have been evaluated, although the literature on this topic is still scarce. Rainbow trout fed with 30% of BSF prepupa meals showed lower final BW and SGR values, and equal FCR rates to the control, whereas the inclusion of 45% of partially defatted pupa meal in a feed did not affect these parameters ([Hoc et al., 2021](#), [Cardinaletti et al., 2022](#)). As for BSF larva meals in largemouth bass, the growth and the FCR were negatively affected by the use of prepupa meal (10% inclusion), due to the high

affected by the use of prepupa meal (10% inclusion), due to the high chitin content ([Fischer et al., 2022](#)).

Considering the results highlighted so far, the growth performance of the considered aquatic species does not appear to be affected negatively by the inclusion of YM meal, while the effect of BSF seems to vary, depending on the fish species. Nevertheless, it is possible to observe variable results within the same species, due to the different compositions of insect meals derived from breeding substrates and the effects of the processing treatments. The variability of the results could be reduced by a greater standardisation of the insect-based products, and this condition could be profitable for practical applications.

Finally, the studies conducted heretofore represent a solid starting point to understand the feasibility of using insect meals, and to open new research lines on how to improve their application in aquaculture.

 FEEDBACK

Quality of the products

Aquaculture products are appreciated by consumers throughout the world because of their nutritional benefits, which are mostly related to their richness in n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids (n-3 **PUFAs**), and because of their sensory attributes. n-3 PUFAs are mainly accumulated in the fillets of fish as a result of their diet and, in specific species, are partly synthesised through an endogenous production (especially in freshwater species). Therefore, the use of feeds with a high n-3 PUFA content is mandatory to maintain this nutritional characteristic, although for some species more than for others.

Fish meal and fish oil are commonly used in the diets of carnivorous fish to provide them with a high n-3 PUFA content. Although the nutritional composition of insects depends to a great extent on the rearing substrates, insect lipids are primarily composed of saturated fatty acids (**SFAs**) and monounsaturated fatty acids (**MUFAs**), while PUFAs – especially, n-3 PUFAs – are scarce ([Aguilar, 2021](#)). Therefore, even though insects are considered valuable alternative sources of proteins, the nutritional value of fish products could be affected by the employed feed, if not (completely) defatted. [Caimi et al. \(2021\)](#) reported that the use of partially defatted BSF larva meals in rainbow trout feeds led to a larger amount of SFAs and MUFAs in the fillets, whereas the PUFAs (particularly n-3) decreased as the BSF meal inclusion increased. Similarly, [Mastoraki et al. \(2020\)](#) found an altered fatty acid profile in European seabass fed on YM and housefly meals, as a substitution for 30% of fish meal. Specifically, since n-6 PUFAs were abundant in the diet, the fish fillets had higher contents of these fatty acids. Conversely, the substitution of fish meal with BSF larvae did not affect the n-3 PUFAs when compared with the control diet. The

discrepancy in the results pertaining to the employment of BFS meals in rainbow trout and European seabass could be related to the type of BSF meals that were employed, as well as the differences in the two species of fish, the basal diets, and environmental factors ([Mastoraki et al., 2020](#)). Indeed, the chemical composition of the fatty acids in the two BSF meals differed. These variations can be ascribed to both the substrates fed to the insects and to the lipid processing and extraction methods ([Mastoraki et al., 2020](#)). Furthermore, [Pulido et al. \(2022\)](#) showed that, in fillets of gilt-head sea bream fed on BSF meals, the n-3 PUFAs decreased in favour of SFAs, but the overall amount of n-3 PUFAs positioned in the middle position (sn-2) of the triglycerides did not reduce.

Several studies have reported a lack of variation in the physical properties, such as the colour, of the fillets from fish fed on insect meals ([Pulido et al., 2022](#)).

Insect-based feeds in poultry

 FEEDBACK

The perception of consumers and stakeholders

Poultry farming is the second most important agricultural sub-sectors in many countries, after the fish sector ([Shaviklo, 2023](#)). This has led to a growing interest in finding sustainable alternative sources to traditional soybean meals for laying hens, due to the need to reduce costs and overcome animal feed shortages ([Shaviklo, 2023](#)). In recent years, insects used as feed ingredient in poultry farming have become a valuable solution as they introduce nutritional, environmental, and animal welfare benefits ([Spartano and Grasso, 2021a](#)).

[Spartano and Grasso \(2021a\)](#) conducted one of the first studies on eggs produced from insect-fed hens. They found that the type of feed is not one of the main attributes that consumers from the United Kingdom focused on when buying eggs; free-range labels, price, and organic production were the most important attributes. In addition, when providing information about the environmental, food waste, and animal welfare benefits, the intention of the consumers to purchase and consume eggs from insect-fed hens increased.

[Spartano and Grasso \(2021b\)](#) recruited a UK sample (n=294) using a market company to obtain gender, age, and geographic area representativeness. Their results showed a limited consumer awareness of the use of insects as feed ingredient. However, they found that most participants were willing to try and pay a premium price for such products, with an average willingness to pay all the respondents of £1.26, i.e., on average 18% more than the price of conventional free-

of £1.50, i.e., on average 10% more than the price of conventional free-range eggs on the UK market.

[Lippi et al. \(2021\)](#), through an online survey, investigated the willingness to buy and eat eggs from hens fed with insects by recruiting a sample of Italian consumers (no=510). The participants were recruited on a national basis via advertisements posted on websites and social networks. The obtained results showed that 40% of the participants would buy and eat eggs laid by hens fed on insect-derived meals as “hens already eat insects as part of their natural diet”. However, as in previous studies, the participants also highlighted that food neophobia is an important aspect that can influence the use of insects for human consumption.

[Altmann et al., 2022](#), considering poultry meat, recruited a representative sample (no=1197) of participants who were selected on the basis of their gender and the age quotas of the German population. In this discrete choice experiment, the consumers stated a preference for poultry breasts from insect-fed chickens ([Altmann et al., 2022](#)). In this study, an information statement (i.e., “Insect-based feeds can increase the flavour of poultry meat”) was provided to a group of respondents prior to the choice experiment. The supply of such information led to an increase in the acceptance and the willingness to pay for insect-fed chicken breasts. The authors suggested that informing consumers about the link between feedstuff and meat colour could strengthen the consumers' trust in product attributes, without decreasing their quality expectations.

[Menozzi et al. \(2021\)](#) investigated the willingness of Italian consumers (no=565) to purchase, eat, and pay for meat obtained from farmed duck fed on insects. The sample was recruited online, and participants were excluded if they were vegetarian/vegan. The provision of information about the environmental, safety, nutritional, and taste-related aspects of insect-based feeds led to a significant increase in the intention of the participants to eat such products. This result helps to confirm that increasing the knowledge of consumers about insect-based diets reduces their fear of using insects in animal feeds, which, in the specific case, they believed could lead to less tastier final products. In addition, most of the respondents reported that they would like information about the use of insect meal to be provided on the label. Interestingly, when the participants were asked about their opinion on eating duck fed on insect-based diets, most of the respondents reported either curiosity or indifference, followed by a pleasant sense of surprise.

Providing information on the benefits of insects in feeds, including the fact that insects are eaten in nature by poultry, has been shown to

 FEEDBACK

fact that insects are eaten in nature by poultry, has been shown to increase consumers' interest in animal welfare. This latter aspect has been shown to be a direct determinant of the purchasing intention of consumers to buy duck meat from ducks fed with either insect-based meal or live insects ([Sogari et al., 2022b](#)). The possibility of using live insects in feeds is important, considering the growing attention that has been demonstrated towards animal welfare when purchasing meat. This is in line with what many consumers reported as one of the main reasons for consuming farmed duck fed on an insect-based diet, i.e., poultry already feeding on insects in their natural environment ([Menozzi et al., 2021](#)).

Unlike in the fish sector, no research on the perception of stakeholders on the use of insect feeds in poultry and egg production in EU countries has been conducted. The few studies on this topic are from Africa and South America.

According to the global market forecasts, the number of insect protein meals sold to the poultry sector in 2030 will be 70000 tonnes/year for layers and 50000 tonnes/year for broilers, that is, 14 and 10% of the total insect protein meals of 500000 tonnes/year, respectively ([de Jong and Nikolik, 2021](#)). In Europe, 20–30% of the produced insect meal will be used in the poultry sector, of which 60% will be destined for laying hens and 40% for broiler production. By 2030, 1 in 40 eggs consumed in the EU will be derived from insect-fed laying hens and 1 in 50 chicken meat servings will be derived from insect-fed broilers ([IPIFF, 2021](#)).

 FEEDBACK

Insect meals in poultry diets

Since insects are a food source for many bird species, their introduction into poultry farming is being studied intensively. The scientific research in this field has covered different types of insect meals, species, and stages of development. Furthermore, these studies have focused on both broiler chickens and laying hens. Recently, broiler chicken trials have been carried out using whole meals from different insect species, such as BSF, housefly, YM, silkworm (*Bombyx mori*), and superworm (*Zophobas morio*). All the aforementioned references tested iso-proteic and iso-energetic diets. [Murawska et al. \(2021\)](#), starting from BSF, tested high full-fat meal inclusion levels (starter: 20–30 and 40%; grower: 20–25 and 35%; finisher: 10–20 and 30%) and reported a lower growth performance (BW, feed intake, and average daily gain (**ADG**)) in the insect-treatments than in the control, except for the ADG of the 10% group during the finisher phase. As far as FCR is concerned, no differences were observed between the control and the two diets with the lowest inclusion levels, whereas the dietary

treatment with the highest insect-content yielded the lowest value (Murawska et al., 2021). On the other hand, the use of BSF prepupa (5% of inclusion), YM (2, 2.5, 4, 5, and 8% of inclusion), and housefly (4 and 8% of inclusion) larva full-fat meals determined equal results, in terms of BW, feed intake, ADG and FCR, to the control group (Elangovan et al., 2021, Elahi et al., 2022). Broiler chickens fed on diets containing 17% of YM whole meals displayed the same BW and ADG values as silkworm and control dietary treatments, while *Zophobas morio* values were the lowest (Pietras et al., 2021). The feed intake decreased for insect-based diets, compared to the control, and the YM-fed birds ate less than those fed with silkworms. This led the silkworm and *Zophobas morio* groups to perform similar FCRs to the control, while the FCR for YM was the lowest (Pietras et al., 2021). As highlighted by Benzertiha et al. (2020), the use of low *Zophobas morio* inclusion levels (2–3%) did not affect the growth performance of broilers. As far as defatted meal is concerned, only BSF was tested, at 4 and 10% inclusion levels, and no difference between the dietary treatments was observed in terms of feed intake or FCR. Nevertheless, the highest inclusion level led to a reduced BW value (Hartinger et al., 2021).

The research on laying hens has recently focused above all on the use of BSF meals, whether full-fat or defatted. According to the review of Elahi et al. (2022), the inclusion of full-fat BSF larva meals affected both the growth and production of laying hens. All the laying pullets fed on insect diets (3, 6, and 9% of inclusion), from 1 to 42 days old, showed higher BW and ADG values than the control. Moreover, the numbers recorded for the 3% treatment were higher than those for the 6%, 9%, and control groups (Elahi et al., 2022). The same outcome was found for the feed/gain ratio, where insect-based diets led to lower values than the control, with the 3% group equalling the 6% one, and both showing higher values than the 9% group (Elahi et al., 2022). The 3% full-fat BSF meal inclusion also generated positive effects on the production performance. The egg weight of laying hens fed on the 3% insect diets was higher than the 1–5% and control groups, while the egg production was comparable with the 5% and control ones (Elahi et al., 2022). Heuel et al., 2021, with regard to the defatted meal, tested two products derived from different insect companies (A: industrial scale; B: small-scale) at 15% of inclusion. The authors observed similar feed intakes, laying percentages, and FCR between the hens fed on insect diets and the control, while the egg weight and mass were lower for diet B than for both diet A and the control (Heuel et al., 2021). This result confirmed that the breeding systems and the substrates of the insects can influence the chemical composition of meals and, consequently, the growth performance of the animals fed on such meals. For this reason, standardised insect products (regarding the

protein and lipid contents) would ensure the possibility of conducting comparisons between experimental trials.

Quality of the final products

The quality of poultry meat and eggs is notoriously affected by various factors, from the genetics of the bird, the farming system, and the age of the animal, to the slaughtering method. The diet of the animals could also play a major role when all the other factors are fixed.

[Shaviklo et al. \(2021\)](#) analysed raw and cooked meat samples of Ross 308 male broilers fed on YM meal and found negative sensory attributes (especially for the 3% inclusion level of YM meal). The raw samples showed an impaired odour and flavour, with reduced yellowness and pinkness on the leg and breast skin, increased darkness of the carcass skin, and of the skinless leg and breast. Similar results were also found for cooked samples, where YM inclusion was found to impair the juiciness and acceptance of the meat, while it increased the perception of the odour and flavour of chickpeas. Thus, an increment in the YM levels corresponded to a reduction in meat quality (in 24-day-old broilers). However, when the feeds containing the insect meal were suspended and the animals were fed the control feed for 18 days, no differences were detected in the sensory parameters between the control and the YM groups.

Colour changes were also found in broilers fed on BSF meals, with a linear increment and a reduction in the redness and yellowness of the breast, respectively ([Schiavone et al., 2019](#)). BSF meals also affected the fatty acid profile of the meat, with increased SFA and MUFA contents, to the detriment of the PUFA fraction ([Schiavone et al., 2019](#)). [Dabbou et al. \(2020\)](#) reported significant modifications in the fatty acid profile of free-range chickens fed on YM meals. On one hand, the inclusion of YM meals significantly reduced the number of SFAs, as well as the atherogenicity and thrombogenicity indexes, but increased the MUFAs in the breast. On the other hand, the effects of the dietary insect meals on the fatty acid profile of the thigh meat were negligible and the atherogenicity and thrombogenicity indexes were not influenced by insect inclusion.

[Heuel et al. \(2021\)](#) tested BSF meals and oil in feeds for laying hens and noted an absence of differences in most of the egg quality characteristics. Indeed, no significant effects were detected in shell stability, egg composition, or in the albumen and yolk physio-chemical composition (proximate composition, colour, and Haugh units). [Bejaei and Cheng \(2020\)](#) fed laying hens on full-fat dried BSF larvae, in replacement of soybean meals and soybean oil. This switch led to an inferior egg quality and to appearance and taste concerns. Minor

 FEEDBACK

modifications were detected in the yolk fat content when a linear increasing amount of insect inclusion was employed in the feed; however, the perceptions of odour, flavour, and texture were not affected. A higher proportion of yolk was detected in the eggs of Lohmann Brown Classic laying hens fed on BSF meal as a replacement for soya bean (100%, [Secci et al., 2018](#)). The yolks derived from the hens fed on BSF meals also showed a higher redness index and were richer in γ -tocopherol, [lutein](#), β -carotene, and total [carotenoids](#). Moreover, despite the fatty acid profiles of the yolks being similar between the diets, the eggs derived from the hens fed with insect meals showed decreased yolk cholesterol levels (11%).

 FEEDBACK

Insect-based feeds in pig

The perception of consumers and stakeholders

Compared to the previously discussed animal species, few studies have been performed on the acceptance of consumers and stakeholders concerning the use of insects as feeds ingredient for pigs. This could be due to the fact that the EU has only recently authorised the use of insects as an ingredient in pig diets ([Commission Regulation, 2021](#)).

[Verbeke et al. \(2015\)](#) conducted the first study that investigated the perception of consumers on the use of insects in feeds for farmed pigs, compared to other species. The research involved a group (no=415) of farmers, [agriculture](#) sector stakeholders, and citizens who were recruited from among the visitors to an agricultural fair (Agriflanders) in Flanders, Belgium. The study mainly focused on the attitudes towards the idea of including insects in feeds and the willingness to eat different products obtained from insect-fed animals, including eggs, poultry meat, fish, pork, beef, and milk. The results showed that the consumers' acceptance of pork was lower than that of eggs, poultry, and fish, but higher than that of beef and milk. One possible explanation for these results could be that insects were perceived as a more 'natural' or even 'naturally preferred' food source for fish and poultry than for other animal species, especially ruminants ([Verbeke et al., 2015](#)).

[Weinrich and Busch \(2021\)](#), in a recent study conducted on a German sample (no=618) recruited online by a professional panel provider, found that consumers, in general, did not consider they were well-informed about animal nutrition. In addition, the participants had less knowledge of the practices of feeding pigs than those of [feeding poultry](#). However, even though uninformed, the consumers' willingness to purchase meat obtained using alternative protein

sources was high. The participants' willingness to buy insect-fed poultry was in fact higher than their willingness to buy insect-fed pork.

Finally, nowadays, there is a higher acceptance for using insects as feed ingredient to produce fish and poultry meat than to produce pork (Verbeke et al., 2015). However, due to the low number of consumer studies that have focused on pigs fed with insects and their derived products (e.g., pork chops, sausages), there is still a great deal of room for researchers to investigate the potential of this market in more detail. Today, the pig sector is still a niche for insect feeds but, according to the global market forecasts, the quantity of insect protein meals should increase and reach a quantity of 30000 tonnes/year (for piglets) by 2030, thus, representing 6% of the total demand for insect protein meals, that is, 500000 tonnes/year (de Jong and Nikolik, 2021). In Europe, 5–15% of such insect meals will go to the pig sector. By 2030, 1 in 100 pig meat servings consumed in the EU will be derived from insect-fed pigs (IPIFF, 2021).

 FEEDBACK

Insect meals in pig diets

The information on the use of insects in swine feeds is limited, compared to poultry and aquaculture. This gap may be due to the number of insects required for an experimental trial, which is higher for swine than for other species, and the size of the insect-rearing companies, which does not allow them to produce a sufficient number of products (Hong and Kim, 2022); therefore, most studies have focused on the evaluation of insect meal effects on the growth of weaned piglets (in trials lasting about 4 weeks). Furthermore, despite the research on this growth phase being scarce, these studies have covered several insect species, development stages, and types of meals. Moreover, all the cited references in this section tested iso-proteic and iso-energetic diets.

As far as full-fat meal is concerned, BSF and cricket (*Gryllus bimaculatus*) products were tested at higher inclusion levels than YM (10–20%, 4.2–5–6%, and 1–2–3%, respectively). No difference, in terms of the average daily feed intake, average daily gain (ADG), and gain-to-feed ratio, was identified for the above-mentioned species, when compared to control diets formulated with conventional animal proteins (Ao et al., 2020, Håkenåsen et al., 2021, Boontiam et al., 2022, Cho et al., 2022). In the same growing period, Tang et al., 2021 evaluated BSF full-fat prepupa meal in an enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* environment, considering an inclusion level of 3%. The growth performance, even in this scenario, was not affected by the dietary treatments (Tang et al., 2021). The 2.5% inclusion of defatted YM meals

generated a higher ADG than the 5% inclusion level; however, both levels were equal to the control for the ADG, average daily feed intake, and gain-to-feed ratio parameters (Ko et al., 2020). The same outcome was confirmed by Cho et al. (2022), who tested the 3% inclusion level of hydrolysate YM meals and did not observe any differences from the control.

As reviewed by Hong and Kim (2022), only one trial with increasing inclusion levels of BSF full-fat meals (6, 9, 12, and 14%) has been conducted during the finishing phase. In this feeding phase, inclusion levels equal to or higher than 9% led to a reduced FCR and higher ADG parameters than the control, whereas the parameters of the 6% dietary treatment were comparable (Hong and Kim, 2022).

Considering the above-reported background, insect meals do not seem to generate negative effects in the weaning phase. Nevertheless, studies are still necessary to assess the maximum inclusion percentage. Finally, during the finishing phase, the inclusion of percentages of between 9 and 14% of BSF meals seems to positively affect the growth performance of pigs.

 FEEDBACK

Quality of the final products

As previously mentioned, only a few research studies have investigated the practice of feeding insects to swine. Altmann et al. (2019) replaced 50, 75, or 100% of soybean meals with partially defatted BSF meals in the diet of barrows. The insect diet did not modify the physio-chemical characteristics, such as the proximate composition, the colour, the cooking loss, or the lipid oxidation, of the pork. Partially defatted BSF meals induced only slight variations in the meat odour, although the overall odour was stronger; however, no off-odour or off-flavour were detected by the panellists. Furthermore, the inclusion of the BSF meal increased the juiciness of the meat, compared to the control meat, while the remaining characteristics were rated similarly (i.e., the hardness, adhesiveness, malleability, moistness, crumbliness, tenderness, and the number of chews necessary before swallowing).

The modifications in the fatty acid composition of the backfat were mostly related to the lauric acid (C12:0) content of the partially defatted BSF meal. Since lauric acid represents one of the richest fatty acids in the pupae, this modification is quite normal in monogastric animal tissues when non-totally defatted BSF meal is employed.

Other alterations were identified, that is, increased γ -linolenic acid (C18:3n-6) and linoleic acid (C18:2n-6) contents. Therefore, as previously reported, other changes in products from animals fed on insect meals could be related to both the substrates employed in the

insect rearing and the processing of the insect products ([Meyer-Rochow et al., 2021](#)). Nevertheless, [Altmann et al. \(2019\)](#) did not report any differences in lipid oxidation in steaks from the control and from BSF-fed pigs when packed under MAP (modified atmosphere packaging).

[Yu et al. \(2019\)](#) tested two dietary inclusion levels of dried BSF larva powder (4 and 8%) in finishing pigs, at the expense of soybean meals, and reported an increased marbling of the loins (*longissimus thoracis*), but no effect on the pH, the colour, the drip loss, or the tenderness were observed. The inclusion of BSF powder also induced changes in the fatty acid profile of the loins. Animals fed on the insect diet showed increased concentrations of lauric acid (C12:0), myristic acid (C14:0), palmitoleic acid (C16:1), arachidonic acid (C20:4), eicosapentaenoic acid (C20:5), and docosahexaenoic acid (C22:6) in their muscles, whereas the α -linoleic acid (C18:3n-3) concentration decreased. Nevertheless, no differences were detected between the SFA, MUFA, and PUFA concentrations of the different dietary groups. [Chia et al. \(2021\)](#) reported variations in the liver of animals related to the inclusion of BSF in pig diets. The organ was richer in CPs when the total amount of fish meal was replaced with BSF meals. Furthermore, the loins presented percentages of crude fat that were around five times higher than the control ones. Feeding insect meal to the pigs also induced increased Fe and Zn concentration levels in the loins and increased K levels in both the loins and livers.

 FEEDBACK

Discussion

This narrative review article is aimed at providing valuable insights for scientists and animal industry stakeholders who are interested in investigating the potential role of employing insect meals in animal diets as a sustainable alternative to conventional feeds.

Because of the recent advancements in the EU authorisations on the use of insect feeds, only a few studies have been conducted on the potential interest of adopting this innovation. Therefore, future research should focus more on the stakeholder's perception of this promising feed and on understanding the barriers to (e.g., high costs) and drivers of (e.g., better product quality) the adoption of insect meals. The upscaling of the insect sector will assumedly lead to a decrease in prices and an increase in market availability ([Rumbos et al., 2021](#)).

Furthermore, even though most of the consumer studies have suggested that individuals are interested in this type of innovation (i.e., insect-fed animals), certain limitations, such as social biases in the

insect-fed animals), certain limitations, such as social biases in the responses, should be considered due to the hypothetical scenario and online nature of the conducted studies (e.g., no real products or actual prices). If society is interested in undertaking this change, it will be facilitated by a further understanding of the main factors that influence the perceptions of consumers, which will also provide support to policy makers and producers in the development of strategies that could successfully support this sector. For example, the strategic provision of information through public campaigns and general communication on the production methods of farm animals, including environmental and sustainability aspects of the feed source, could increase the awareness and acceptance of consumers of farmed animals fed on insects. In addition, a part of the literature (e.g., [Spartano and Grasso, 2021b](#)) suggests that insect-fed animals should be marketed under enhanced animal welfare standards (e.g., using free-range labelling). Thus, a critical role for the success of this emerging alternative feedstuff hinges on the provision of appropriate information at the point of sales, including the use of a labelling system, accredited by reliable sources, on the product packaging.

Conclusions

Despite the large number of research studies conducted on the effects of insect-based feeds on the growth performance of conventional livestock animals, the results in some cases appear to be conflicting. A qualitative standardisation of insect products would allow defined inclusion levels to be determined for the different livestock species.

 FEEDBACK

Studies on the sensory evaluation of insect-fed animals are rather limited and future research should thus focus on consumer and sensory studies to investigate whether and how the product attributes and the overall liking can favour the acceptance of insect-fed animals. In addition, considering that the type of feed is not the main decisional factor when purchasing meat products, future studies should measure the trade-off between this attribute and other elements, such as the origin of a product and the farming methods.

Ethics approval

Not applicable.

Data and model availability statement

None of the data was deposited in an official repository. Information can be made available from the authors upon request.

Author ORCIDs

G. Sogari: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2561-571X> ↗.

S. Bellezza Oddon: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8942-0682> ↗.

L. Gasco: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1829-7936> ↗.

A. van Huis: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4213-4539> ↗.

T. Sprangers: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6789-3531> ↗.

S. Mancini: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8643-507X> ↗.

Author contributions

All the authors contributed equally to this work.

Declaration of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

None.

Financial support statement

None

Transparency Declaration

This article is part of a supplement entitled Selected keynote lectures of the 73rd Annual Meeting of the European Federation of Animal Science (Porto, Portugal) supported by the Animal Consortium.

 **FEEDBACK**

References

[Aguilar, 2021](#) J.G. dos S. Aguilar

An overview of lipids from insects

Biocatalysis and Agricultural Biotechnology, 33 (2021), Article 101967



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[View in Scopus](#) ↗

[Google Scholar](#) ↗

[Altmann et al., 2019](#) B.A. Altmann, C. Neumann, S. Rothstein, F. Liebert, D.

Mörlein

Do dietary soy alternatives lead to pork quality

improvements or drawbacks? A look into micro-alga and insect protein in swine diets

Meat Science, 153 (2019), pp. 26-34

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Altmann et al., 2022](#) B.A. Altmann, S. Anders, A. Risius, D. Mörlein
**Information effects on consumer preferences for
alternative animal feedstuffs**

Food Policy, 106 (2022), Article 102192

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Ankamah-Yeboah et al., 2018](#) I. Ankamah-Yeboah, J.B. Jacobsen, S.B. Olsen
**Innovating out of the fishmeal trap: The role of insect-
based fish feed in consumers' preferences for fish
attributes**

British Food Journal, 120 (2018), pp. 2395-2410

[View article](#) [Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Ao et al., 2020](#) X. Ao, J.S. Yoo, Z.L. Wu, I.H. Kim
**Can dried mealworm (*Tenebrio molitor*) larvae replace
fish meal in weaned pigs?**

Livestock Science, 239 (2020), Article 104103

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Baldi et al., 2021](#) L. Baldi, T. Mancuso, M. Peri, L. Gasco, M.T. Trentinaglia
**Consumer attitude and acceptance toward fish fed with
insects: a focus on the new generations**

Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 8 (2021), pp. 1249-1263

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Barroso et al., 2019](#) F.G. Barroso, M.J. Sánchez-Muros, M.Á. Rincón, M.
Rodríguez-Rodríguez, D. Fabrikov, E. Morote, J.L. Guil-Guerrero
**Production of n-3-rich insects by bioaccumulation of
fishery waste**

Journal of Food Composition and Analysis, 82 (2019), Article 103237

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Bazoche and Poret, 2020](#) P. Bazoche, S. Poret
**Acceptability of insects in animal feed: A survey of
French consumers**

Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 20 (2020), pp. 251-270

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Bejaei and Cheng, 2020](#) M. Bejaei, K.M. Cheng

 **FEEDBACK**

The effect of including full-fat dried black soldier fly larvae in laying hen diet on egg quality and sensory characteristics

Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 6 (2020), pp. 305-314

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

Benzertiha et al., 2020 A. Benzertiha, B. Kierończyk, P. Kołodziejcki, E.

Pruszyńska-Oszmałek, M. Rawski, D. Józefiak, A. Józefiak

Tenebrio molitor and Zophobas morio full-fat meals as functional feed additives affect broiler chickens' growth performance and immune system traits

Poultry Science, 99 (2020), pp. 196-206



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Boontiam et al., 2022 W. Boontiam, J. Hong, S. Kitipongpysan, S.

Wattanachai

Full-fat field cricket (*Gryllus bimaculatus*) as a substitute for fish meal and soybean meal for weaning piglets: effects on growth performance, intestinal health, and redox status

Journal of Animal Science, 100 (2022), p. skac080

[View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

Borrelli et al., 2021 L. Borrelli, L. Varriale, L. Dipineto, A. Pace, L.F. Menna, A.

Fioretti

Insect derived lauric acid as promising alternative strategy to antibiotics in the antimicrobial resistance scenario

Frontiers in Microbiology, 12 (2021), Article 620798

[View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

Caimi et al., 2021 C. Caimi, I. Biasato, G. Chemello, S.B. Oddon, C. Lussiana,

V.M. Malfatto, M.T. Capucchio, E. Colombino, A. Schiavone, F. Gai, A.

Trocino, A. Brugiapaglia, M. Renna, L. Gasco

Dietary inclusion of a partially defatted black soldier fly (*Hermetia illucens*) larva meal in low fishmeal-based diets for rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)

Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology, 12 (2021), p. 50

[View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

Cardinaletti et al., 2022 G. Cardinaletti, P. Di Marco, E. Daniso, M. Messina, V.

Donadelli, M.G. Finoia, T. Petochi, F. Fava, F. Faccenda, M. Contò, R.

Cerri, D. Volpatti, C. Bulfon, A. Mandich, A. Longobardi, G. Marino, L.F.

Pulido-Rodriguez, G. Parisi, E. Tibaldi

Growth and welfare of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in response to graded levels of insect and plant

[FEEDBACK](#)

mykiss) in response to graded levels of insect and poultry
by-product meals in fishmeal-free diets

Animals, 12 (2022), p. 1698

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Chia et al., 2021](#) S.Y. Chia, C.M. Tanga, I.M. Osuga, A.O. Alaru, D.M. Mwangi,
M. Githinji, T. Dubois, S. Ekesi, J.J.A. van Loon, M. Dicke

Black soldier fly larval meal in feed enhances growth
performance, carcass yield and meat quality of finishing
pigs

Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 7 (2021), pp. 433-447

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Cho et al., 2022](#) K.H. Cho, V. Sampath, A.J. Kim, J.S. Yoo, I.H. Kim

Evaluation of full-fatted and hydrolysate mealworm
(*Tenebrio molitor*) larvae as a substitute for spray-dried
plasma protein diet in weaning pigs

Journal of Animal Physiology and Animal Nutrition, 107 (2022), pp. 589-
597

[View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Dabbou et al., 2020](#) S. Dabbou, L. Gasco, C. Lussiana, A. Brugiapaglia, I.

Biasato, M. Renna, L. Cavallarin, F. Gai, A. Schiavone

Yellow mealworm (*Tenebrio molitor* L.) larvae inclusion
in diets for free-range chickens: effects on meat quality
and fatty acid profile

Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems, 35 (2020), pp. 571-578

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Dagevos, 2021](#) H. Dagevos

A literature review of consumer research on edible
insects: recent evidence and new vistas from 2019
studies

Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 7 (2021), pp. 249-259

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Dawood and Koshio, 2020](#) M.A.O. Dawood, S. Koshio

Application of fermentation strategy in aquafeed for
sustainable aquaculture

Reviews in Aquaculture, 12 (2020), pp. 987-1002

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[de Jong and Nikolic, 2021](#) B. de Jong, G. Nikolic

No Longer Crawling: Insect Protein to Come of Age in the
2020s

RaboResearch, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (2021)

— — — — —

 **FEEDBACK**

[DiGiacomo and Leury, 2019](#) K. DiGiacomo, B.J. Leury

Review: Insect meal: a future source of protein feed for pigs?

Animal, 13 (2019), pp. 3022-3030



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[Crossref ↗](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[EFFOP, 2019](#) EFFOP

Case study – Fishmeal and fish oil

European Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture Products,
4 (2019) (2019), pp. 23-31

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Elahi et al., 2022](#) U. Elahi, C.-C. Xu, J. Wang, J. Lin, S.-G. Wu, H.-J. Zhang, G.-H. Qi

Insect meal as a feed ingredient for poultry

Animal Bioscience, 35 (2022), pp. 332-346

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Elangovan et al., 2021](#) A.V. Elangovan, A. Udayakumar, M. Saravanakumar, V.B. Awachat, M. Mohan, M.S. Yandigeri, S. Krishnan, A. Mech, S.B.N. Rao, K. Giridhar, R. Bhatta

Effect of black soldier fly, *Hermetia illucens* (Linnaeus) prepupae meal on growth performance and gut development in broiler chicken

International Journal of Tropical Insect Science, 41 (2021), pp. 2077-2082

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[EU, 2021](#) EU

Fishmeal and fish oil: Production and trade flows in the EU. European Market Observatory for fisheries and aquaculture

EU, Brussels, Belgium (2021)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[European Commission, 2001](#) European Commission, 2001. Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 laying down rules for the prevention, control and eradication of certain transmissible spongiform encephalopathies. EU, Brussels, Belgium.

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[European Commission, 2017](#) European Commission, 2017. Regulation (EU) 2017/893 amending Annexes I and IV to Regulation (EC) No. 999/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council and

999/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Annexes X, XIV and XV to Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 as regards the provisions on processed animal protein. EU, Brussels, Belgium.

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

European Commission, 2021 European Commission, 2021. Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/1372 of 17 August 2021 amending Annex IV to Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the prohibition to feed non-ruminant farmed animals, other than fur animals, with protein derived from animals. EU, Brussels, Belgium.

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Feng et al., 2021 W. Feng, S. Wang, X. Duan, W. Wang, F. Yang, J. Xiong, T. Wang, C. Wang

A novel approach for enhancing lipid recovery for biodiesel production from wet energy biomass using surfactants-assisted extraction

Renewable Energy, 170 (2021), pp. 462-470

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Ferrer Llagostera et al., 2019 P. Ferrer Llagostera, Z. Kallas, L. Reig, D. Amores de Gea

The use of insect meal as a sustainable feeding alternative in aquaculture: Current situation, Spanish consumers' perceptions and willingness to pay

Journal of Cleaner Production, 229 (2019), pp. 10-21

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Fischer et al., 2022 H. Fischer, N. Romano, N. Renukdas, V. Kumar, A.K. Sinha

Comparing black soldier fly (*Hermetia illucens*) larvae versus prepupae in the diets of largemouth bass, *Micropterus salmoides*: Effects on their growth, biochemical composition, histopathology, and gene expression

Aquaculture, 546 (2022), Article 737323

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

Ghamkhar and Hicks, 2020 R. Ghamkhar, A. Hicks

Comparative environmental impact assessment of aquafeed production: Sustainability implications of forage fish meal and oil free diets

Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 161 (2020), Article 104849



[Giotis and Drichoutis, 2021](#) T. Giotis, A.C. Drichoutis

Consumer acceptance and willingness to pay for direct and indirect entomophagy

Q Open, 1 (2021), p. qoab015

[View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Godfray et al., 2018](#) H.C.J. Godfray, P. Aveyard, T. Garnett, J.W. Hall, T.J. Key, J. Lorimer, R.T. Pierrehumbert, P. Scarborough, M. Springmann, S.A. Jebb

Meat consumption, health, and the environment

Science, 361 (2018), p. eaam5324

[View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Håkenåsen et al., 2021](#) I.M. Håkenåsen, G.H. Grepperud, J.Ø. Hansen, M. Øverland, R.M. Ånestad, L.T. Mydland

Full-fat insect meal in pelleted diets for weaned piglets: Effects on growth performance, nutrient digestibility, gastrointestinal function, and microbiota

Animal Feed Science and Technology, 281 (2021), Article 115086

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Hartinger et al., 2021](#) K. Hartinger, J. Greinix, N. Thaler, M.A. Ebbing, N. Yacoubi, K. Schedle, M. Gierus

Effect of graded substitution of soybean meal by hermetia illucens larvae meal on animal performance, apparent ileal digestibility, gut histology and microbial metabolites of broilers

Animals, 11 (2021), p. 1628

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Heuel et al., 2021](#) M. Heuel, C. Sandrock, F. Leiber, A. Mathys, M. Gold, C. Zurbrügg, I.D.M. Gangnat, M. Kreuzer, M. Terranova

Black soldier fly larvae meal and fat can completely replace soybean cake and oil in diets for laying hens

Poultry Science, 100 (2021), Article 101034

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Hoc et al., 2021](#) B. Hoc, T. Tomson, P. Malumba, C. Blecker, M.H. Jijakli, G. Purcaro, F. Francis, R. Caparros Megido

Production of rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) using black soldier fly (Hermetia illucens) prepupae-based formulations with differentiated fatty acid profiles

Science of The Total Environment, 794 (2021), Article 148647

[Hong and Kim, 2022](#) J. Hong, Y.Y. Kim

Insect as feed ingredients for pigs

Animal Bioscience, 35 (2022), pp. 347-355

[Crossref](#)  [View in Scopus](#)  [Google Scholar](#) 

[IFIF, 2022](#) IFIF, 2022. Global Feed Statistics. Retrieved on 22 June 2023 from <https://ifif.org/global-feed/statistics/> .

[Google Scholar](#) 

[IPIFF, 2020a](#) IPIFF, 2020a. Edible insects on the European market. Retrieved on 22 June 2023 from <https://ipiff.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/10-06-2020-IPIFF-edible-insects-market-factsheet.pdf> .

[Google Scholar](#) 

[IPIFF, 2020b](#) IPIFF, 2020b. The insect sector milestones towards sustainable food supply chains. Retrieved on 22 June 2023 from <https://ipiff.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/IPIFF-RegulatoryBrochure-update07-2020-1.pdf> .

[Google Scholar](#) 

[IPIFF, 2021](#) IPIFF, 2021. An overview of the European market of insects as feed. Retrieved on 22 June 2023 from https://ipiff.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Apr-27-2021-IPIFF_The-European-market-of-insects-as-feed.pdf .

[Google Scholar](#) 

[Ko et al., 2020](#) H. Ko, Y. Kim, J. Kim

The produced mealworm meal through organic wastes as a sustainable protein source for weanling pigs

Journal of Animal Science and Technology, 62 (2020), pp. 365-373

[Crossref](#)  [View in Scopus](#)  [Google Scholar](#) 

[Lawal et al., 2021](#) K.G. Lawal, R.R. Kavle, T.O. Akanbi, M. Miroso, D. Agyei
Enrichment in specific fatty acids profile of Tenebrio molitor and Hermetia illucens larvae through feeding

Future Foods, 3 (2021), Article 100016

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus](#) 
[Google Scholar](#) 

[Lippi et al., 2021](#) N. Lippi, S. Predieri, C. Chieco, G.M. Daniele, M. Cianciabella, M. Magli, L. Maistrello, E. Gatti
Italian consumers' readiness to adopt eggs from insect-fed hens

Animals, 11 (2021), p. 3278

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Makkar et al., 2014](#) H.P.S. Makkar, G. Tran, V. Heuzé, P. Ankers

State-of-the-art on use of insects as animal feed

Animal Feed Science and Technology, 197 (2014), pp. 1-33



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Mastoraki et al., 2020](#) M. Mastoraki, P. Mollá Ferrándiz, S.C. Vardali, D.C.

Kontodimas, Y.P. Kotzamanis, L. Gasco, S. Chatzifotis, E. Antonopoulou

A comparative study on the effect of fish meal substitution with three different insect meals on growth, body composition and metabolism of European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax* L.)

Aquaculture, 528 (2020), Article 735511



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Melenchón et al., 2022](#) F. Melenchón, E. de Mercado, H.J. Pula, G. Cardenete,

F.G. Barroso, D. Fabrikov, H.M. Lourenço, M.-F. Pessoa, L. Lagos, P.

Weththasinghe, M. Cortés, C. Tomás-Almenar

Fishmeal dietary replacement up to 50%: A comparative study of two insect meals for rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)

Animals, 12 (2022), p. 179

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Menozzi et al., 2021](#) D. Menozzi, G. Sogari, C. Mora, M. Gariglio, L. Gasco, A.

Schiavone

Insects as feed for farmed poultry: are Italian consumers ready to embrace this innovation?

Insects, 12 (2021), p. 435

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Meyer-Rochow et al., 2021](#) V.B. Meyer-Rochow, R.T. Gahukar, S. Ghosh, C. Jung

Chemical composition, nutrient quality and acceptability of edible insects are affected by species, developmental stage, gender, diet, and processing method

Foods, 10 (2021), p. 1036

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Moruzzo et al., 2021](#) R. Moruzzo, F. Riccioli, S. Espinosa Díaz, C. Secci, G. Poli,

S. Mancini

Mealworm (*Tenebrio molitor*): Potential and challenges to promote circular economy

Animals, 11 (2021), p. 2568

[FEEDBACK](#)

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Mulazzani et al., 2021](#) L. Mulazzani, F.A. Madau, P. Pulina, G. Malorgio
Acceptance of insect meal in aquaculture feeding: A stakeholder analysis for the Italian supply chains of trout and seabass

Journal of the World Aquaculture Society, 52 (2021), pp. 378-394

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Murawska et al., 2021](#) D. Murawska, T. Daszkiewicz, W. Sobotka, M. Gesek, D. Witkowska, P. Matusevičius, T. Bakula

Partial and total replacement of soybean meal with full-fat black soldier fly (*Hermetia illucens* L.) larvae meal in broiler chicken diets: impact on growth performance, carcass quality and meat quality

Animals, 11 (2021), p. 2715

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Niyonsaba et al., 2021](#) H.H. Niyonsaba, J. Höhler, J. Kooistra, H.J. Van der Fels-Klerx, M.P.M. Meuwissen

Profitability of insect farms

Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 7 (2021), pp. 923-934

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[OECD and FAO, 2020](#) OECD and FAO, 2020. OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2020-2029. OECD Publishing, Paris, France/FAO, Rome, Italy.

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Olugbire et al., 2021](#) O.O. Olugbire, S. Olorunfemi, D.O. Oke
Global utilisation of cereals: sustainability and environmental issues

Agro Science, 20 (2021), pp. 9-14

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Pietras et al., 2021](#) M. Pietras, S. Orczewska-Dudek, W. Szczurek, M. Pieszka
Effect of dietary lupine seeds (*Lupinus luteus* L.) and different insect larvae meals as protein sources in broiler chicken diet on growth performance, carcass, and meat quality

Livestock Science, 250 (2021), Article 104537

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Poveda, 2021](#) J. Poveda
Insect frass in the development of sustainable

 [FEEDBACK](#)

 [FEEDBACK](#)

agriculture. A review

Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 41 (2021), p. 5

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Pulido et al., 2022 L. Pulido, G. Secci, G. Maricchiolo, L. Gasco, F. Gai, A. Serra, G. Conte, G. Parisi

Effect of dietary black soldier fly larvae meal on fatty acid composition of lipids and sn-2 position of triglycerides of marketable size gilthead sea bream fillets

Aquaculture, 546 (2022), Article 737351



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Reyes et al., 2020 M. Reyes, M. Rodríguez, J. Montes, F.G. Barroso, D. Fabrikov, E. Morote, M.J. Sánchez-Muros

Nutritional and growth effect of insect meal inclusion on seabass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) feeds

Fishes, 5 (2020), p. 16

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[FEEDBACK](#)

Ritchie and Roser, 2022 Ritchie, H., Roser, M., 2022. Soy. Retrieved on 30 September 2022, from <https://ourworldindata.org/soy> ↗.

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Rumbos et al., 2021 C.I. Rumbos, E. Mente, I.T. Karapanagiotidis, G. Vlontzos, C.G. Athanassiou

Insect-based feed ingredients for aquaculture: A case study for their acceptance in Greece

Insects, 12 (2021), p. 586

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

Schiavone et al., 2019 A. Schiavone, S. Dabbou, M. Petracci, M. Zampiga, F. Sirri, I. Biasato, F. Gai, L. Gasco

Black soldier fly defatted meal as a dietary protein source for broiler chickens: effects on carcass traits, breast meat quality and safety

Animal, 13 (2019), pp. 2397-2405



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[Crossref ↗](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

Secci et al., 2018 G. Secci, F. Bovera, S. Nizza, N. Baronti, L. Gasco, G. Conte, A. Serra, A. Bonelli, G. Parisi

Quality of eggs from Lohmann Brown Classic laying hens fed black soldier fly meal as substitute for soya bean

Animal, 12 (2018), pp. 2191-2197



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[Crossref ↗](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[FEEDBACK](#)

[Shaviklo, 2023](#) A.R. Shaviklo

The influence of insect-derived and marine-based diets on sensory quality of poultry meat and egg: a systematic review

Journal of Food Science and Technology, 60 (2023), pp. 1903-1922

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Shaviklo et al., 2021](#) A.R. Shaviklo, A.H. Alizadeh-Ghamsari, S.A. Hosseini

Sensory attributes and meat quality of broiler chickens fed with mealworm (*Tenebrio molitor*)

Journal of Food Science and Technology, 58 (2021), pp. 4587-4597

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Smetana et al., 2019](#) S. Smetana, E. Schmitt, A. Mathys

Sustainable use of *Hermetia illucens* insect biomass for feed and food: Attributional and consequential life cycle assessment

Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 144 (2019), pp. 285-296



[View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[FEEDBACK](#)

[Sogari et al., 2019](#) G. Sogari, M. Amato, I. Biasato, S. Chiesa, L. Gasco

The potential role of insects as feed: A multi-perspective review

Animals, 9 (2019), p. 119

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Sogari et al., 2022a](#) G. Sogari, H. Dagevos, M. Amato, D. Taufik

Consumer Perceptions and Acceptance of Insects As Feed and Food: Current Findings and Future Outlook BT - Novel Foods and Edible Insects in the European Union: An Interdisciplinary Analysis, Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland (2022), pp. 147-169

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Sogari et al., 2022b](#) G. Sogari, D. Menozzi, C. Mora, M. Gariglio, L. Gasco, A. Schiavone

How information affects consumers' purchase intention and willingness to pay for poultry farmed with insect-based meal and live insects

Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 8 (2022), pp. 197-206

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Spartano and Grasso, 2021a](#) S. Spartano, S. Grasso

Consumers' Perspectives on Eggs from Insect-Fed Hens: A UK Focus Group Study

Foods, 10 (2021), p. 420

[FEEDBACK](#)

[Spartano and Grasso, 2021b](#) S. Spartano, S. Grasso

UK consumers' willingness to try and pay for eggs from insect-fed hens

Future Foods, 3 (2021), Article 100026



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Surendra et al., 2020](#) K.C. Surendra, J.K. Tomberlin, A. van Huis, J.A.

Cammack, L.-H.-L. Heckmann, S.K. Khanal

Rethinking organic wastes bioconversion: Evaluating the potential of the black soldier fly (*Hermetia illucens* (L.)) (Diptera: Stratiomyidae) (BSF)

Waste Management, 117 (2020), pp. 58-80



[View PDF](#)

[View article](#)

[View in Scopus ↗](#)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Tang et al., 2021](#) Q. Tang, E. Xu, Z. Wang, M. Xiao, S. Cao, S. Hu, Q. Wu, Y.

Xiong, Z. Jiang, F. Wang, G. Yang, L. Wang, H. Yi

Dietary *Hermetia illucens* Larvae Meal Improves Growth Performance and Intestinal Barrier Function of Weaned Pigs Under the Environment of Enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* K88

Frontiers in Nutrition, 8 (2021), Article 812011

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[FEEDBACK](#)

[Tran et al., 2022](#) H.Q. Tran, T.T. Nguyen, M. Prokešová, T. Gebauer, D.H. Van, V.

Stejskal

Systematic review and meta-analysis of production performance of aquaculture species fed dietary insect meals

Reviews in Aquaculture, 14 (2022), pp. 1637-1655

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[van Huis et al., 2021](#) A. van Huis, B.A. Rumpold, H.J. van der Fels-Klerx, J.K.

Tomberlin

Advancing edible insects as food and feed in a circular economy

Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 7 (2021), pp. 935-948

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Verbeke et al., 2015](#) W. Verbeke, T. Sprangers, P. De Clercq, S. De Smet, B.

Sas, M. Eeckhout

Insects in animal feed: Acceptance and its determinants among farmers, agriculture sector stakeholders and

...

citizens

Animal Feed Science and Technology, 204 (2015), pp. 72-87

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

 [FEEDBACK](#)

[Voora et al., 2020](#) V. Voora, C. Larrea, S. Bermudez

Global Market Report: Soybeans

International Institute for Sustainable Development, Winnipeg,
Manitoba, Canada (2020)

[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Wachira et al., 2021](#) M.N. Wachira, I.M. Osuga, J.M. Munguti, M.K. Ambula, S.
Subramanian, C.M. Tanga

Efficiency and improved profitability of insect-based aquafeeds for farming Nile Tilapia Fish (*Oreochromis niloticus* L.)

Animals, 11 (2021), p. 2599

[Crossref ↗](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Weinrich and Busch, 2021](#) R. Weinrich, G. Busch

Consumer knowledge about protein sources and consumers' openness to feeding micro-algae and insects to pigs and poultry

Future Foods, 4 (2021), Article 100100

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Weththasinghe et al., 2021](#) P. Weththasinghe, L. Lagos, M. Cortés, J.Ø.
Hansen, M. Øverland

Dietary inclusion of black soldier fly (*Hermetia Illucens*) larvae meal and paste improved gut health but had minor effects on skin mucus proteome and immune response in Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo Salar*)

Frontiers in Immunology, 12 (2021), Article 599530

[View in Scopus ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

 [FEEDBACK](#)

[Yu et al., 2019](#) M. Yu, Z. Li, W. Chen, T. Rong, G. Wang, J. Li, X. Ma

Use of *Hermetia illucens* larvae as a dietary protein source: Effects on growth performance, carcass traits, and meat quality in finishing pigs

Meat Science, 158 (2019), Article 107837

 [View PDF](#) [View article](#) [View in Scopus ↗](#)
[Google Scholar ↗](#)

[Zainol Abidin et al., 2020](#) N.A. Zainol Abidin, F. Kormin, N.A. Zainol Abidin,
N.A.F. Mohamed Anuar, M.F. Abu Bakar

The potential of insects as alternative sources of chitin:

An overview on the chemical method of extraction from various sources

International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 21 (2020), p. 4978

[Crossref ↗](#) [Google Scholar ↗](#)

 FEEDBACK

Cited by (53)

Exploring sustainable alternatives in aquaculture feeding: The role of insects

2024, Aquaculture Reports

Citation Excerpt :

...Despite the potential and beneficial aspects of using insects in aquaculture, as this is an emerging sector, some limiting factors must be considered. Insect feeding substrates should be standardized, since their composition impacts the nutritional composition of the protein obtained (Sogari et al., 2023). Likewise, the percentage of conventional protein sources that could be replaced by insect ingredients need to be defined (Van Huis et al., 2021) for different fish species....

[Show abstract](#) ✓

A comprehensive review on the potential applications of medicine Polygonatum species in the food sector

2024, Food Bioscience

Citation Excerpt :

...Therefore, there is a great potential for the application of Polygonatum in the cosmetic industry. Livestock and poultry product quality and safety are not solely reliant on processing but also on adopting appropriate feeding practices (Sogari et al., 2023). To maintain animal health, the conventional farming industry often resorts to excessive antibiotic administration in animal feed, which can lead to drug resistance and residual drug presence, posing risks to human health....

[Show abstract](#) ✓

 FEEDBACK

Analysis of yellow mealworm (*Tenebrio molitor*) frass as a resource for a sustainable agriculture in the current context of insect farming industry growth

2024, Journal of Cleaner Production

Citation Excerpt :

...Numerous studies indicate that insect meal could be a viable substitute for the meals currently used in animal feeding, offering a strong potential

alternative (Sogari et al., 2023). From a scientific perspective, the utilization of insects as both food and feed generates hundreds of publications annually, undergoing continuous review (Sogari et al., 2023; Hawkey et al., 2020). Edible insects are nothing new....

[Show abstract](#) ✓

Applications of insect nutrition resources in animal production

2024, Journal of Agriculture and Food Research

Citation Excerpt :

...It has been reported that 12 % of greenhouse gas emissions come from livestock production and 30 % of human-induced terrestrial biodiversity loss can be attributed to animal production [65]. The production of 1 kg of edible protein from milk, poultry, pork, or beef generates more greenhouse gases, uses more comparable energy, and takes up more area than the production of insect protein sources [17,68,69]. Many scientists believe that insects can replace conventional poultry in the food chain because they provide a more environmentally friendly source of protein than traditional animal sources [70]....

 [FEEDBACK](#)

[Show abstract](#) ✓

Climate change, public health, and animal welfare: towards a One Health approach to reducing animal agriculture's climate footprint ↗

2024, Frontiers in Animal Science

Edible Insects: A New Sustainable Nutritional Resource Worth Promoting ↗

2023, Foods

 [View all citing articles on Scopus](#) ↗

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of The Animal Consortium.



[About ScienceDirect](#) ↗
[Privacy policy](#) ↗

[Remote access](#)

[Contact and support](#) ↗

[Terms and conditions](#) ↗

 RELX™

Cookies are used by this site. [Cookie settings](#)

All content on this site: Copyright © 2025 Elsevier B.V., its licensors, and contributors. All rights are reserved, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. For all open access content, the relevant licensing terms apply.

 [FEEDBACK](#)

