

***“Hurts less, lasts longer”
experiences of young people receiving high-dose subcutaneous infusions of
benzathine penicillin G to prevent rheumatic heart disease***

Julie Cooper¹, Stephanie L Enkel², Dhevindri Moodley¹, Hazel Dobinson³, Erik Andersen³, Joseph H Kado², Renae K Barr², Sam Salman^{2,4,5}, Michael G Baker¹, Jonathan R Carapetis^{2,6,7}, Laurens Manning^{2,5,8}, Anneka Anderson⁹, Julie Bennett^{1*}

¹ Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand

² Telethon Kids Institute, Nedlands, Western Australia

³ Te Whatu Ora, Capital, Coast and Hutt Valley, Wellington, New Zealand

⁴ Clinical Pharmacology and Toxicology Unit, PathWest, Perth, Western Australia

⁵ Internal Medicine, the University of Western Australia, Australia

⁶ Perth Children’s Hospital, Nedlands, Western Australia

⁷ Centre for Child Health Research, the University of Western Australia, Australia

⁸ Fiona Stanley Hospital, Nedlands, Western Australia

⁹ Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, Te Kupenga Hauora Māori, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

* Corresponding author

E-mail: Julie.bennett@otago.ac.nz

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Four-weekly intramuscular (IM) benzathine penicillin G (BPG) injections to prevent
3 acute rheumatic fever (ARF) progression have remained unchanged since 1955. A Phase-I trial in
4 healthy volunteers demonstrated the safety and tolerability of high-dose SubCutaneous Infusions of
5 BPG (SCIP) which resulted in a much longer effective penicillin exposure, and fewer injections. Here
6 we describe the experiences of young people living with ARF participating in a Phase-II SCIP trial.

7 **Methodology:** Participants (n=20) attended a clinic in Wellington, New Zealand (NZ). After a physical
8 examination, participants received 2% lignocaine followed by 13.8mL (6 vials) to 20.7mL (9 vials) of
9 BPG (Bicillin-LA®; determined by weight), into the abdominal subcutaneous tissue. Semi-structured
10 interviews and observations were taken during and after the infusion, as well as on days 28 and 70.
11 All interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and thematically analysed.

12 **Principal Findings:** Low levels of pain were reported on needle insertion, during and following the
13 infusion. Some participants experienced discomfort and bruising on days one and two post dose;
14 however, the pain was reported to be less severe than their usual IM BPG. Participants were
15 ‘relieved’ to only need injections quarterly and the overwhelming majority preferred to continue
16 with SCIP.

17 **Conclusions:** Participants preferred SCIP over their usual regimen, reporting less pain and a
18 preference for the longer time gap between treatments. Recommending SCIP as standard of care for
19 most patients needing long-term ARF/RHD prophylaxis has the potential to transform secondary
20 prophylaxis of ARF/RHD in NZ and globally.

21 **Synopsis**

22 Acute rheumatic fever (ARF) is a preventable inflammatory disease that occurs as a delayed sequelae
23 to group A streptococcus (GAS) infection. ARF and its complication rheumatic heart disease (RHD)
24 have significant negative effects on health, often resulting in chronic illness and premature death. For
25 70 years, the only proven way to prevent ARF progression has been benzathine penicillin G (BPG),
26 given as a monthly intramuscular (IM) injection for a minimum of 10 years. The effectiveness of this
27 approach is limited by pain and the frequency of injection which leads to suboptimal adherence.
28 There is an urgent need to improve penicillin formulations for all children living with ARF and RHD.
29 Here we describe the experiences of 20 young people living with ARF participating in a Phase-II trial
30 delivering high-dose SubCutaneous Infusions of Penicillin (SCIP) in order to provide longer effective
31 penicillin exposure, and therefore fewer injections. Participants in the trial overwhelmingly preferred
32 high-dose SCIP over their usual monthly IM penicillin regimen, reporting less pain and a preference
33 for the longer time gap (28 versus 70 days) between treatments. Reducing injection frequency from
34 13 to four-or-five per year, may improve adherence and reduce disease progression. Offering
35 widespread SCIP to ARF/RHD patients to evaluate long-term adherence, preferences and disease
36 progression has the potential to transform secondary prophylaxis of ARF/RHD both in New Zealand
37 and globally.

38

39 Introduction

40 Acute rheumatic fever (ARF) is an immune-mediated inflammatory disease that occurs as a delayed
41 sequela to group A streptococcus (GAS) infection [1, 2]. A single acute or several episodes of ARF can
42 progress to rheumatic heart disease (RHD); a serious condition characterised by permanent heart
43 valve damage that may result in early death. It is estimated that 33.4 million people worldwide live
44 with RHD, resulting in approximately 319,400 deaths each year [3]. ARF and RHD have all but
45 disappeared from high-income countries, yet in Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ), they remain an alarming
46 and inequitable cause of preventable suffering and death for Indigenous Māori and Pacific Peoples
47 [4].

48

49 Since the 1950s, benzathine penicillin G (BPG) has been used extensively for the treatment of several
50 infectious diseases - including ARF and RHD – with a unique and useful characteristic being its
51 prolonged serum concentration. Referred to as secondary prophylaxis [5, 6], four- weekly
52 intramuscular (IM) injections of BPG [7] are needed to ensure plasma penicillin concentrations
53 remain above 0.02mg/L (20ng/mL), a pharmacological surrogate of protection against repeated GAS
54 infections that may worsen disease [8]. Current NZ guidelines recommend patients with ARF have a
55 minimum 10 years of secondary prophylaxis or until the patient is aged 21 years for mild disease, 30
56 years for moderate or 40 years for severe cases [9]. It is also recommend that patients receive at
57 least 80% of secondary prophylaxis injections (11 of 13 each year); however, reported adherence is
58 much lower than this [10].

59

60 The pain associated with IM BPG injection is frequently cited as a reason for lack of adherence to
61 secondary prophylaxis [11, 12]. Therefore, the addition of lignocaine to reduce injection pain has
62 been recommended by the NZ Ministry of Health [13]. Additionally, application of pressure and
63 temperature packs are two methods that have shown significant reduction in pain scores with IM
64 BPG injections [11, 14, 15]. However, ultimately to improve adherence and prevent disease

65 progression there is an urgent need to improve the delivery and formulation of long acting penicillins
66 [16].

67

68 A consultation with global experts in RHD suggested changing formulations of BPG to produce a
69 product that is longer acting, less painful, and/or more reliable in its pharmacokinetics [12, 17]. They
70 concluded that an acceptable reformulation would need to: be administered subcutaneously; have a
71 dosing schedule greater than six weeks; be less or no more painful than existing BPG; be cold-chain
72 independent; and of comparable cost to IM BPG [12].

73

74 Recent work has found subcutaneous (SC) delivery of BPG to be safe and potentially advantageous.
75 In a randomised cross-over trial, Kado et al., [18] compared the pharmacokinetic profile and
76 tolerability of BPG delivered by IM and SC routes of administration. Subcutaneous delivery was
77 superior, having a more prolonged duration of effect, comparable pain scores and no adverse effects
78 [18].

79

80 Building on this trial, it was predicted that SC infusion of high-dose BPG could provide adequate
81 penicillin concentrations for up to three months. To test the safety and tolerability of high-dose SC
82 Infusion of benzathine Penicillin (SCIP-I), a dose escalation Phase-I trial was conducted in 24 healthy
83 adults [19]. The study concluded that delivering high-dose SCIP was safe, had acceptable tolerability
84 and could be suitable for up to three-monthly dosing intervals for secondary prophylaxis of ARF/RHD
85 [19]. In addition to the Phase-I trial, a qualitative sub-study was undertaken to provide in-depth
86 information about the tolerability and acceptability of SCIP [20]. The sub-study demonstrated that
87 SCIP was acceptable to participants, and while some experienced higher pain levels, most had
88 tolerable mild discomfort. Potential approaches to alleviate pain and discomfort were explored and
89 suggestions included distractions, a slower infusion time and larger doses of lignocaine anaesthesia.

90

Incorporating the learnings from the SCIP-I, progression to a Phase-II study investigating the delivery of high-dose SC BPG was undertaken in NZ children and young adults with ARF currently receiving secondary prophylaxis (SCIP-II). This paper reports the findings of a qualitative SCIP-II sub-study aiming to assess the acceptability of SCIP compared to the current regimen experienced by participants.

Methods

The methods of the SCIP-I trial have been described elsewhere[19] with SCIP-II following a similar approach. In brief, 20 participants with ARF and prescribed to receive four-weekly IM BPG attended an outpatient clinic in Wellington, NZ. Following a physical examination, participants received 2% lignocaine (up to 5mLs) to the subcutaneous abdominal space through a 22G Saf-T-Intima Cannula. This was followed by 13.8mL (7.2 million units [MU]; 6 vials) to 20.7mL (10.8 MU; 9 vials) of BPG delivered via a series of slow manual pushes, from manufacturer's prefilled 2.3mL glass syringes (Bicillin-LA®, Pfizer) [21], dosed according to participant's weight (Table 1). One difference in the BPG administration between SCIP-I and SCIP-II was that to deliver Bicillin-LA® SCIP-I used a spring-driven syringe infusion pump (Springfusor® 30, Go Medical Industries Pty Ltd., Subiaco, Australia) with the use of a variable flow control device (VersaRate® Plus, EMED Technologies, El Dorado Hills, California, USA). SCIP-II opted instead to use a series of slow, steady pushes, as this enabled better control over the infusion speed and mitigated the need to transfer the contents of the pre-filled syringes into a larger syringe.

Table 1. Bicillin-LA dosing for subcutaneous infusion

Weight (kg)	Number of vials	Volume (mL)
30-50	6	13.8
50-70	7	16.1
70-90	8	18.4
>90	9	20.7

115 *Data collection*

116 The study applied a qualitative Kaupapa Māori research design and included individual semi-
117 structured interviews and participant observations. Kaupapa Māori research is a critical framework
118 that gives meaning to the life of Māori and analyses unequal relations of power that influence Māori
119 wellbeing. Such a framework allows for an empowering lens that places Māori at the centre of the
120 study and rejects cultural deficit explanations [22, 23].

121

122 Participant observations were undertaken alongside audio-recorded participants interviews, which
123 were conducted at three-time points; day 0 (during and after the infusion), day 28 and day 70
124 following dosing. In addition, participant observations were recorded on days one and two and
125 demographic data were collected via case report forms. All interviews occurred face-to-face, with the
126 first taking place at the bedside in the outpatient department, and the last two in the community
127 (generally the participant's home). Observational data were collected in a field journal by the study
128 nurse or researcher, transcribed and analysed as described below. The semi-structured interviews
129 used a standardised interview guide consisting of a series of open-ended questions regarding
130 experience of the infusion, tolerability of the procedure, pain during and following the infusion, and
131 comparisons to their usual IM BPG injections. To supplement the semi-structured interviews,
132 individual audio-recorded informal interviews were had with the study nurse, a community nurse,
133 and two researchers.

134

135 Quantitative pain was measured using a numerical rating score (NRS) on a 0-10 scale during
136 participant interviews: 0 and 10 represented 'no pain' and 'worst pain imaginable', respectively. We
137 considered minimal clinically-important differences (MCID) for moderate pain (NRS 4-7) and severe
138 pain (NRS 8-10) to be 1.3 and 1.8, respectively as reported, although there is no accepted MCID for
139 mild pain (NRS 1-3) [24].

140

142 *Data analysis*

143 Interviews were transcribed verbatim along with field observations. Pseudonyms are used in place of
144 names. Transcripts and observations were read repeatedly by one investigator who conducted the
145 majority of the interviews and highlighted initial codes using NVIVO 12 [25]. Thematic saturation was
146 defined as when new incoming data produced little to no new information on the topic under
147 exploration. For some themes saturation was reached with the first 11 participants and no further
148 themes were identified after 15 interviews. Included in the general inductive data analysis, were
149 observations and experiences captured from those present during the infusions, including those
150 from the study nurse, a community nurse, and two researchers. Raw qualitative data codes and
151 themes were presented to Māori and Pacific researchers to assess cultural meaningfulness.

152

153 *Ethical approval*

154 The ethical considerations of the study were approved by the NZ Health and Disability Ethics
155 Committee (11094) and endorsed by Te Whatu Ora, Capital Coast and Hutt Valley Health, which
156 included review by their Māori Research Board (RAG-M #916). In addition, the trial is registered with
157 the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ACTRN12622000916741). All participants (or
158 their parent / legal guardian) provided written, informed consent prior to participating, with
159 information and consent forms available in Te Reo Māori and Samoan.

160

161

162

Results

Characteristics of participants

Of the 20 participants, the mean age was 15 years (range 6-32 years). Most participants were female (14, 70%). The majority (12, 60%) identified as Pacific (9 Samoan, 3 Tongan), with seven Indigenous Māori (35%), and one NZ European (Table 2). On average the infusion took 15 minutes (range 9-25 minutes).

Table 2. Characteristics of research participants

Pseudonym	Sex	Age band (years)	Ethnicity
Leilani	Female	20-24	Samoan
Anaru	Male	15-19	Māori/NZ European
Matisse	Female	15-19	Samoan
Sana	Male	5-9	Samoan
Mika	Male	15-19	Samoan
Mia	Female	10-14	Samoan
Hana	Female	20-24	Māori
Ani	Female	15-19	Māori
Talia	Female	20-24	Samoan
Lucy	Female	15-19	NZ European
Mele	Male	10-14	Tongan
Aroha	Female	15-19	Māori
Sione	Male	10-14	Tongan
Lulu	Female	10-14	Samoan
Marino	Male	10-14	Māori/NZ European
Nina	Female	>24	Māori
Sefina	Female	10-14	Samoan
Natia	Female	10-14	Samoan
Kiri	Female	10-14	Māori
Langi	Female	10-14	Tongan

Thematic analysis

The thematic analysis revealed that although there was some initial anxiety from participants, in general, they experienced less pain with SCIP delivery when compared to IM. There was a strong preference to remain on SCIP. These findings are further described across six themes below.

178 *Anxiousness prior to SCIP*

179 Anxiety was evident for many participants. As most of the participants had become used to
180 having their IM BPG injections, coming in for an unknown procedure was an uncomfortable
181 experience, with many participants arriving anxious, as described by Talia and Leilani:

182 *“A bit nerve wracking. I was a bit anxious. But it was okay, there was no pain.”*

183 *“I thought it would hurt more; I was overthinking it.”*

184

185 Developing a rapport with SCIP providers early on was key to reducing participant’s anxiety.
186 Likewise, offering a *koha* (acknowledgement) in recognition of participant contribution and
187 expenses (travel, parking), plenty of *kai* (food), iPads and Wi-Fi as distractions, and referral of
188 *whānau* (families) to support services when needed, were all reported by participants as key
189 facilitators of rapport and anxiety reduction. As the study progressed the Research Nurse
190 was also able to reassure participants about some of the positive experiences from the early
191 participants.

192

193 *Little pain during the needle insertion*

194 For most participants inserting the needle containing the analgesia did not cause a lot of
195 pain, it was often noted that ‘I barely felt it’ or described it as a tickle/tingle. For participants
196 who did feel pain, it was described as a short, sharp, or stingy sensation that quickly
197 subsided. Sana and Leilani describe their experiences:

198 *“I barely felt it, didn’t hurt, bit of a pinch” [from nurse holding skin].*

199 *“Quite sharp pain didn’t last very long, just when it goes into the skin then can’t feel it*
200 *after that.”*

201

202 *Little or no pain during the subcutaneous infusion*

203 The majority of participants described having no or very little pain during the infusion. This
204 was validated through the NRS where half of participants reported no pain at all during or
205 after the infusion (NRS of 0). It was noted by the nurse and the researchers that many of the
206 participants relaxed once the infusion started and many participants became sleepy during
207 the procedure. Hana, Sana and Matisse describe that the infusion was not painful:

208 *“No pain at all, just felt nurses’ hand on my tummy, [when needle went in]. During*
209 *the process I didn’t notice it at all to be honest, I could see it but couldn’t feel it.”*

210 *“No pain” (smiling)*

211 *“Don’t feel anything, no pain”*

212

213 However, for some participants the infusion was associated with pain, which was often
214 described as stinging, hard or numb. The pain was validated through pain scores which
215 ranged from NRS 1-5. Sione described the infusion as:

216 *“Weird, hot as it was going in. Burning, stinging. It stops and goes. Halfway through*
217 *pain went up then when finished it went down.”*

218

219 For a small minority the pain increased during the infusion from low levels to sometimes
220 quite painful nearing the end. Near the end of the infusion Nina described feeling:

221 *“A little bit uncomfortable now, it is like a pull pain, like the volume expanding.”*

222

223 Two of the participants were in a state of discomfort with pain scores of seven. Without an
224 understanding of participants’ pain tolerance, it was hard to know how much of the pain

was a result of anxiety to the procedure. By the time they went home they were all feeling more comfortable (pain scores all below three). Aroha explains how she was feeling.

“It is so sore going in, stingy sore like a bee sting. Oh my god I was crying because I was anxious. I was scared for my life.”

One potential explanation for the different experiences of pain may be that participants who had slighter quicker infusions (range 9-15 minutes) reported significantly less pain than participants whose infusions took slightly longer (range 16-25 minutes).

Experiences and wellbeing in the days and weeks following SCIP

The Research Nurse observed that over half of participants had some discomfort one day following dosing and some participants had redness or bruising. However, by day two participants reported less pain, mean NRS 1.7 (range 0-5), and by day three all participants were free of discomfort or pain and life had resumed back to normal. On day 28 post-dosing when participants reflected on their experience almost all reported that the pain on day one and two had not stopped them doing their usual activities. Matisse found that the infusion didn't stop her doing anything:

“Only a little pain and bruising did not stop me from doing anything.”

Intramuscular BPG is more painful than SCIP

When compared to their normal IM injection most participants found SCIP significantly less painful, with provided pain scores for their last IM averaging NRS 5 (range 0-9). Following IM injections, several participants noted that the pain post-IM lasted several days and made it

248 uncomfortable to sit down, sleep or participate in normal activities. Talia and Hana describe
249 how they felt after their usual IM injection:

250 *“With my injection I feel pain which lasts 3-4 days sitting down and sleeping. With*
251 *the infusion one I didn’t have that pain”*

252 *“Pain [from monthly injection] is like a sore muscle like I have been hit with a tennis*
253 *ball. It is every time I put pressure on it like sitting down and this lasts for two to*
254 *three days.”*

255

256 Mele and Matisse also found SCIP less painful than their normal IM injection:

257 *“I prefer it on my tummy, as it took just takes two days for pain to go away but with the*
258 *injection in my butt it takes a week as it gets sore every time I sit down”*

259 *“This one is better [than normal] it does not hurt. My normal injection would be a 5”*
260 *[Inserting the SCIP needle was rated 1]*

261

262 *Overwhelming yes to remain on three-monthly SCIP rather than IM BPG*

263 Participants were asked on day 28 (day of regular IM BPG) and 70 (day returning to IM BPG)
264 whether they would prefer SCIP or IM BPG. By day 70 all participants (excluding one) said
265 they would prefer to have SCIP. The nurse noted a sense of real happiness from the
266 participants at not having to go for regular IM BPG injection on day 28 and a palpable sense
267 of relief in their expressions. The key reasons participants gave related to the convenience of
268 having SCIP every three months and reduced pain. Nina and Mia were happy to remain on
269 SCIP:

270 *“I am super relieved, less admin, one less thing for me to think about.”*

271 *“I’d prefer the infusion because I don’t have to get injections every month.”*

272

273 The one participant who preferred not to continue SCIP was a child who tolerated SCIP well
274 but had such a good relationship with the nurse who delivered their regular IM BPG
275 injection that they preferred to see her regularly.

276

277

278 Discussion

279 This study described patient perspectives alongside nurse and researcher observations of a Phase-II
280 trial investigating the delivery of SCIP for those currently receiving standard IM BPG treatment. Our
281 results demonstrate an overwhelming preference by participants with ARF presently prescribed four-
282 weekly secondary prophylaxis to receive less frequent delivery of penicillin via a SC infusion. Of 20
283 participants, 19 wished to remain on SCIP rather than return to their regular four-weekly injection.
284 The young participant who preferred to remain on IM BPG tolerated SCIP very well but having
285 formed a good connection with their usual nurse, preferred to continue seeing them regularly.

286

287 The high level of support for SCIP was due to lower pain levels experienced during the infusion and
288 while some participants experienced discomfort on days one and two following dosing, the pain
289 reported was less severe and of shorter duration than that of their usual injection. These findings
290 reinforce findings from a randomised cross-over trial undertaken by Kado et al., [18] which reported
291 a significantly higher median pain score for those receiving IM BPG (1 [0.25–2]) as opposed to SCIP
292 (0.5 [0–1]), $p=0.03$) 48 hours following dosing [26]. In addition to preferring SCIP because of the
293 reduction in pain, participants responded favourably to the longer duration (70-91 days versus 28
294 days) between dosing. This meant participants did not need to take as much time off work or school
295 and participants felt enabled to do things like go on holiday.

296

By delivering BPG through a series of slow pushes there was a greater control, in comparison to the spring infuser used in SCIP-I, over the rate the BPG was delivered. This potentially led to slightly shorter infusion times; SCIP-I - mean infusion time of 22 minutes, range 16-29 minutes [20], compared to a mean of 15 minutes, range of 9-25 minutes, in SCIP-II. In addition, participants in SCIP-II reported slightly lower pain scores during the infusion in comparison to SCIP-I (median NRS 1.0, range 0-7 median compared to median NRS 2.5, range 0-8) [19]. Further improvements to the delivery of SCIP may be achieved by ensuring patients develop a rapport with SCIP providers to help reduce participant anxiety, to improve patient experience and potentially reduce pain. Facilitating a shorter infusion time, which was typically associated with lower pain and would offer greater convenience for patients and healthcare providers. This could be further supported by penicillin reformulations with a reduced dose volume and/or lower force of administration.

One limitation of the study is that we did not ask about pain tolerance. However, we did compare, and contrast pain experienced during and following SCIP to participants' usual IM BPG (although the latter was reported in retrospect, as a recollection of the pain following their most recent IM BPG injection, which in most cases was four-weeks previously). Another limitation was that some participants were difficult to get feedback from while others found it hard to express how they were feeling. This may have been related to a whānau (family) member being present for support, potentially limiting what participants were willing to say. However, we experienced that whānau were very supportive in terms of helping the participants provide examples of experiences particularly for those participants who found it hard to share their experiences.

A strength of this study was the high level of engagement from participants, with 100% adherence. This was reflective of trust, communication and rapport developed between the study team, health practitioners, and participants. The open-ended nature of the interview questions meant participants were able to discuss challenges with regular IM BPG and day-to-day life. In addition,

323 engagement of Kaupapa Māori Research principles allowed participants to understand the benefits
324 of participation for themselves and others with ARF.
325
326 SCIP is preferred over IM BPG as a tolerable and acceptable route of administration for children and
327 young adults with ARF in Wellington, NZ. Extending this study to support widespread use of SCIP,
328 throughout NZ in patients requiring secondary prophylaxis over a prolonged period will enable better
329 assessment of key measures. It would be useful to undertake an economic evaluation of SCIP in
330 comparison to IM BPG. Current evidence suggests that SCIP should become the standard of care for
331 most patients needing long-term prophylaxis. SCIP has the potential to improve adherence, prevent
332 disease progression and death, transforming prophylaxis of ARF/RHD both in NZ and globally.
333

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank all the participants and their *whānau* (families) for sharing their time and experiences to make this study possible. We would also like to thank the outpatient department at Kenepuru Hospital for sharing their space with us and the wonderful community nurses for supporting the study.

Author contributions: JC; data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing original draft and editing. SE; data analysis, data interpretation, writing original draft and editing. HD; study funding and clinical oversight; EA; clinical oversight and data interpretation, JK, RB, SS; study conceptualization and design, funding. DM; clinical oversight, data collection. MB, JC; funding and data interpretation. LM, AA; study conceptualization and design, funding, data analysis, data interpretation. JB; study conceptualization and design, funding, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing original draft and editing. All authors have read and reviewed the manuscript.

Funding: Cure Kids grant 7012. The funders of this study had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation, or writing of the report.

Competing interests: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Data sharing: Audio-recordings of interviews available on request.

References

1. Parks T, Smeesters PR, Steer AC. Streptococcal skin infection and rheumatic heart disease. *Current opinion in infectious diseases*. 2012;25(2):145-53. Epub 2012/02/14. doi: 10.1097/QCO.0b013e3283511d27. PubMed PMID: 22327467.
2. Carapetis JR, Beaton A, Cunningham MW, Guilherme L, Karthikeyan G, Mayosi BM, et al. Acute rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease. *Nature reviews Disease primers*. 2016;2:15084.
3. Watkins DA, Johnson CO, Colquhoun SM, Karthikeyan G, Beaton A, Bukhman G, et al. Global, Regional, and National Burden of Rheumatic Heart Disease, 1990-2015. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(8):713-22. Epub 2017/08/24. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1603693. PubMed PMID: 28834488.
4. Bennett J, Zhang J, Leung W, Jack S, Oliver J, Webb R, et al. Rising Ethnic Inequalities in Acute Rheumatic Fever and Rheumatic Heart Disease, New Zealand, 2000-2018. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2021;27(1):36-46. Epub 2020/12/23. doi: 10.3201/eid2701.191791. PubMed PMID: 33350929; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7774562.
5. Stollerman GH, Rusoff JH, Hirschfeld I. Prophylaxis against group A streptococci in rheumatic fever; the use of single monthly injections of benzathine penicillin G. *N Engl J Med*. 1955;252(19):787-92. doi: 10.1056/nejm195505122521901. PubMed PMID: 14370428.
6. Broderick MP, Hansen CJ, Russell KL, Kaplan EL, Blumer JL, Faix DJ. Serum penicillin G levels are lower than expected in adults within two weeks of administration of 1.2 million units. *PloS one*. 2011;6(10):e25308. Epub 2011/10/04. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0025308. PubMed PMID: 21991307; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3186770.
7. Craig WA. The hidden impact of antibacterial resistance in respiratory tract infection. Re-evaluating current antibiotic therapy. *Respir Med*. 2001;95 Suppl A:S12-9; discussion S26-7. doi: 10.1016/s0954-6111(01)90023-x. PubMed PMID: 11419669.
8. Zühlke LJ, Beaton A, Engel ME, Hugo-Hamman CT, Karthikeyan G, Katzenellenbogen JM, et al. Group A Streptococcus, Acute Rheumatic Fever and Rheumatic Heart Disease: Epidemiology and Clinical Considerations. *Curr Treat Options Cardiovasc Med*. 2017;19(2):15. doi: 10.1007/s11936-017-0513-y. PubMed PMID: 28285457; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5346434.
9. Heart Foundation of New Zealand. New Zealand Guidelines for Rheumatic Fever: Diagnosis, Management and Secondary Prevention of Acute Rheumatic Fever and Rheumatic Heart Disease. 2014.
10. de Dassel JL, de Klerk N, Carapetis JR, Ralph AP. How Many Doses Make a Difference? An Analysis of Secondary Prevention of Rheumatic Fever and Rheumatic Heart Disease. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2018;7(24):e010223. Epub 2018/12/19. doi: 10.1161/jaha.118.010223. PubMed PMID: 30561268; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6405600.
11. Russell K, Nicholson R, Naidu R. Reducing the pain of intramuscular benzathine penicillin injections in the rheumatic fever population of Counties Manukau District Health Board. *Journal of paediatrics and child health*. 2014;50(2):112-7.
12. Wyber R, Boyd BJ, Colquhoun S, Currie BJ, Engel M, Kado J, et al. Preliminary consultation on preferred product characteristics of benzathine penicillin G for secondary prophylaxis of rheumatic fever. *Drug Deliv Transl Res*. 2016;6(5):572-8. Epub 2016/07/29. doi: 10.1007/s13346-016-0313-z. PubMed PMID: 27465618.
13. New Zealand Ministry of Health. Guidance for administering an intramuscular injection of benzathine benzylpenicillin 2016 [cited 2020 24 July]. Available from:

- https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/pages/nursing_guidance_-_administering_im_penicillin.pdf.
14. Amir J, Ginat S, Cohen YH, Marcus TE, Keller N, Varsano I. Lidocaine as a diluent for administration of benzathine penicillin G. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 1998;17(10):890-3. PubMed PMID: 9802630.
15. Derya E-Y, Ukke K, Taner Y, Izzet AY. Applying manual pressure before Benzathine Penicillin injection for rheumatic fever prophylaxis reduces pain in children. *Pain Manag Nurs*. 2015;16(3):328-35. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmn.2014.08.013>.
16. Anderson A, Leversha A, Ofanoa M, Malungahu G, Burgess H, Wade J, Naisali S, Sims A, Peat B. Māori and pacific experiences of recurrent rheumatic fever and unexpected rheumatic heart disease in New Zealand. Auckland: University of Auckland, 2017.
17. Currie BJ. Benzathine penicillin - down but not out. *NT Dis Control Bull*. 2006;13(2):1-5.
18. Kado JH, Salman S, Henderson R, Hand R, Wyber R, Page-Sharp M, et al. Subcutaneous administration of benzathine benzylpenicillin G has favourable pharmacokinetic characteristics for the prevention of rheumatic heart disease compared with intramuscular injection: a randomized, crossover, population pharmacokinetic study in healthy adult volunteers. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2020;75(10):2951-9. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkaa282. PubMed PMID: 32696033.
19. Kado J, Salman S, Hla T, Enkel S, Henderson R, Hand R, et al. Subcutaneous Infusions of High-Dose Benzathine Penicillin G (SCIP) is Safe, Tolerable and Potentially Suitable for Less Frequent Dosing for Rheumatic Heart Disease Secondary Prophylaxis. *Heart, Lung and Circulation*. 2022;31:S301. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlc.2022.06.515>.
20. Enkel SL, Kado J, Hla TK, Salman S, Bennett J, Anderson A, et al. Qualitative assessment of healthy volunteer experience receiving subcutaneous infusions of high-dose benzathine penicillin G (SCIP) provides insights into design of late phase clinical studies. *PloS one*. 2023;18(4):e0285037. Epub 20230427. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0285037. PubMed PMID: 37104500; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC10138475.
21. Medsafe. New Zealand data sheet - BICILLIN L-A®. Medsafe; 2022.
22. Mahuika R, editor Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial2008.
23. Walker S, Eketone A, Gibbs A. An exploration of kaupapa Maori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2006;9(4):331-44. doi: 10.1080/13645570600916049.
24. Cepeda MS, Africano JM, Polo R, Alcalá R, Carr DB. What decline in pain intensity is meaningful to patients with acute pain? *Pain*. 2003;105(1-2):151-7. PubMed PMID: 14499431.
25. International Q. NVIVO 2022 [cited 2023 July]. Available from: <https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/>.
26. Kado JH, Salman S, Henderson R, Hand R, Wyber R, M P-S, et al. Subcutaneous administration of benzathine benzylpenicillin G has favourable pharmacokinetic characteristics for the prevention of rheumatic heart disease compared with intramuscular injection: a randomized, crossover, population pharmacokinetic study in healthy adult volunteers. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2020:doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkaa282.