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#### Cross-case analysis

#### Values

The following values were found among all cases (PCPs and their facility): commitment to serve the community and professionalism. Indeed all 8 PCPs showed a genuine commitment to do their work well and to serve the people who come to them (if not the community as a whole). Therefore, these values could not differentially influence the performance of the PCPs’ we studied.

We found verbatims (both from the primary care team and the patients) and observed facts that suggested altruism (and commitment to help people) as a shared value in cases 1,6 and 7. For these cases, the financial accessibility was good. The patients are almost always treated, even if they don’t have money at the time of the consultation. In contrary, we found in case 5 (which was where the care was the most expensive in our sampling) profit-oriented values with for instance, the systematic prescription of lab tests to the patients or the multiplication of new " lucrative " services such as paying home visits. In the cases that are owned by governmental institutions (cases 2, 3, 4, and 8), the situation is more mitigated. As public institutions, altruism is part of their official mandate, and in this line the consultations fees in these facilities and the costs of medicines are usually kept low. However, we found encouragement for the PCPs and the facility managers in these cases to make profits, as in their job descriptions, they are expected to "increase the financial revenues of their health facilities". Consequently, even if the costs are relatively lower in these cases than in the case 5, the patients sometimes complain of the high costs in these facilities (especially for cases 8 and 2). The verbatims below illustrated some of the numerous quotes we used to draw our conclusions.

*"The cost is too high and people are talking about it left and right because the activities aren't working and we have no more money. You come and it's 10,000, 15,000 (FCFA) in one go. It's not the agents who put this in their pockets, but it's the things they've written and it's already been published. If the State can help us reduce the cost, it would be a great help for the population."* IDI patient, case 8.

Another value that appeared to influence the performance in our study is the respect for standards and hierarchy. This was found in the cases 3, 5, and 8 and led to a "command and control leadership style" for the PCPs’ in these cases and a limited ability to strengthen the primary care team (especially for cases 3 and 8).

#### Preparation of the PCP to practice at the first- line

We define preparation as the capacitation of the PCPs (before or early in their appointment) to fulfil their role. Cases 1 and 2 are examples where we realize that the lack of preparation of the PCPs negatively impacts their performance and the performance of rest of the team. Indeed, these two physicians have had difficulties to adapt to requirements such as the need to be oriented towards the community, the necessary technical skills, the need to contribute to the strengthening of the primary care team, etc. In contrary, cases 6 and 7 were well prepared thanks to a two-year post-graduate training in community general practice. This preparation helped them to have the necessary skills and attitudes to fulfil their roles and also to prepare psychologically for the difficulties of working in rural areas. Cases 3, 4 and 8 have not received such training, but we have noted a good practice in the public sector whereby the district health management team, in particular the district medical officer, helps the PCPs to understand their role and accompanies them to adapt to it, especially for community work and the implementation of the national health policy. Moreover, case 3 has a good technical effectiveness probably because of his extensive clinical training as a medical specialist. Case 5 has also been prepared for his role to some instance, through a previous practice in a large polyclinic. However, we noted that this "preparation" does not affect all the quality aspects that we have studied for the performance of PCP. It was mainly limited to the technical quality and management of the health facility. Finally, some doctors (e.g. cases 3, 4, 6 and 7) benefited from a undergraduate training which emphasized community-oriented medical practice and which sent doctors to work on the front line in rural areas. This allowed the PCPs in these cases to know the importance of considering the needs of the community and communicating regularly with them.

Based on the analysis above, an adequate preparation of the PCP to practice at the first- line appears as a factor that positively impacts the performance of a PCP. In our study, this factor appeared especially important for the technical effectiveness, the community-orientation and the PCPs’ capacity to strengthen the primary care team. However, we also saw that the dimension of performance influenced by the preparation depends on the nature of this preparation.

#### Continuing education

In some cases (3, 4, 5, 6, and 8) the PCPs have received one or two continuous education trainings in the last 12 months. However, these trainings were offered by various actors, from pharmaceutical companies to the Ministry of Health. The training were also conducted in an ad-hoc basis with usually a focus on the temporal need of the institution offering them, rather than a well-fought curriculum for strengthening the capacities of the PCPs. In fact, for all cases, there is not a systematic or regular continuing education program for the PCPs. Therefore, it was difficult, based on the observations in our study, to draw conclusions on the influence of continuous education (or the lack of it) on the PCPs’ performance.

#### Equipment and infrastructure

The case 5 is the only one where we did not observe a significant insufficiency in the equipment and infrastructures. Yet, many other PCPs managed to have a good performance in various domains despite this insufficiency. For example, the case 3 had manage to follow good clinical standards despite the fact that his consultation room was very small and barely furnished. Similarly, case 6 did not have a digital information system but he managed to guarantee a good continuity of care through an ingenious system for organizing the patients’ files, the support of community health workers and a very good knowledge of the patients and their families. Therefore, we could not conclude that the lack or the presence of equipment and adequate infrastructure had influenced the practices of the PCPs we have observed.

#### Support from the hierarchy, peers or associations

For the cases 3,4, and 8 we objectified a support provided to the PCPs by the District health management teams (DHMTs,) especially the district medical officers who are the direct hierarchical superior of these PCPs. This support included connecting the PCPs with the community leaders, explaining what was expected from the PCPs, providing tips for the facility management, and access to various policy documents, and sometimes coaching the PCPs. This facilitated the good performance of the PCPs in cases 3, 4, and 8 in terms of community orientation and case's contribution to strengthen the local health system. For the case 1, we also observed a support provided by the head of the health center and other senior staff, in terms of feedback for her technical performance. Although this performance was still average at the time we did the study, several stakeholders reported that this support had gradually improved her performance.

Cases 6 and 7 also receive support but this support come from their peers, through regular meetings with the MGCs’ association and a platform to share advice and training opportunities, which improves their technical performance and their performance in managing their health facilities and the patients’ flow. The MGCs’ association also helped them financially to set up the health facility and to acquire the basic equipment. For instance, case 7 could have access to a digital information system for her patients, thanks to an intervention conducted with peers and supported by the association and an international NGO.

Case 5 also mentioned peers’ advice the technical aspects and support from certain health authorities and his former superiors to set up and run his health facility. He however mentioned the lack of financial support and the struggle to maintain the financial viability.

Case 2 was the case where we objectivated the least support to the PCP (if not none at all).

Based on the analysis below, we can see that an adequate support from the hierarchical superior or peers can facilitate a good performance of PCPs’ practice. The performance dimension supported by this support depends on the type of support provided.

Moreover, all doctors for which a certain support exist reported that this support motivates them to stay in their work post and to commit to perform well, as illustrated in the quotes below.

*"As MGCs, we've formed an association in each department… All the community doctors in the department meet as peers. We set up peer groups and we meet in a given place and exchange our practices, and in this way we also keep each other informed… we do this every three months, four times a year…. We're isolated here (in remote areas), but when you know that in three months' time you're going to see your peers again, that's already something, it means you're in a family and the exchanges we share are really important."* IDIPCP, case 7.

*"When I arrived in this health district, I was lucky enough to have had a very good boss, a very good leader who supported me, who enabled me and who let me do what I wanted to do while supervising me. This allowed me to thrive, to open up without knowing or thinking that I was being watched… I had initially stayed in a health district where I didn't have a boss to accompany me… it was very difficult, very difficult to work well and so when I had practically the opposite (here), I understood that in fact it's not the system that's bad but it's the people who are in the system, whether they're good or bad, who make up the system. "* IDI PCP, case 3.

#### The leadership mandate given to the PCP and the degree of autonomy allocated to exert it

The PCPs of the cases 3, 4, and 8 were given by the State the mandate to lead the public health facility of their cases (and coordinating all public health activities in their commune). As owners of their health facilities, the PCPs in the cases 5, 6, and 7 also had the mandate to lead and develop these facilities. This leadership mandate has led the PCPs to implement (effectively or not) activities to strengthen the primary care teams, to improve the quality of care and to develop the equipment and infrastructures. In contrary the PCPs from cases 1 and 2 did not have such leadership mandate and they did not take an interest in activities for developing the head facility or improving the quality of care and the performance of the primary care team.

However, if the analysis above suggests that a leadership mandate can support the PCPs’ performance, further observations shows that this is not always sufficient. The degree of autonomy provided to the PCP to exert his leadership also plays a role. For example, the cases 5, 6 and 7 are self-employed and they have a great autonomy for taking decisions regarding the hiring of the staff, the purchasing of the equipment and supply, the organization of the work, etc. As they themselves have testified, this autonomy helps them to succeed in the development of their health facility, in deciding to allocate sufficient times to clinical activities, and ensuring that the staff is aligned with the performance goals. Case 3, 4 and 8, on the other hand, struggle to accommodate the demands from their hierarchy with the time they need to allocate to the patients and their health facilities. Moreover, they have little room of manoeuvre for holding the primary care team accountable, to innovate in services organization or to purchase equipment, because of the administrative rules they need to follow.

In conclusion, providing a PCP a leadership mandate positively influences his capacity to strengthen the primary care team and facility, but this need to be accompanied by a certain degree of autonomy to exert this mandate.

#### Financing modalities of the PCPs practices

The cases 5 is entirely financed by private funds, mainly the income generated by the services provided. There is thus a strong pressure to mobilize financial resources for the survival of the centre. On the positive side, this pressure leads the PCP and the primary care team to actively seek the patients’ satisfaction in order to attract them, and this could partly explain their efforts to properly welcome the patients, listen to them, and invest in good technical performance. According to the PCP of Case 5, maintaining good technical quality is vital for the survival of their health facility. On the negative side, the pressure to ensure a sufficient revenue for the health centre led to the relatively high costs of the services in this case.

The cases 6 and 7 benefited from an initial financial support from an international NGO and local authorities. The case 1 benefits from some support from the church. This financial support helps the cases 1, 6 and 7 to maintain their costs accessible. However, they also face a pressure to mobilize financial resources for the survival of the centre, as they mainly rely on the income generated by the services offered. Here also, this pressure leads to efforts and strategies to ensure the satisfaction of the patients and the community in order to keep their patient flow. On the other side, despite their commitment for altruism the financial pressure and the need to cope with operational costs led the cases 6 and 7 had to raise the cost of the health services provided in the past year.

Part of the financing for cases 2, 3, 4, and 8 come from the direct payment of health services by the patients. However, we found less financial stress as the other part of the financing come from the State, especially for the staff salary.

We found some strategies to reduce the costs borne by the PCPSs’ practices: the use of generic medicines (cases 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8), targeting a high number of consultations instead of a high price for one consultation (cases 1, 6, and 7), reducing the open hours (case 1), and a good accounting system supported by a professional accountant (case 6).

In summary, when it comes to the financing modalities of the PCPs’ practices, we can conclude that when the PCPs and their facilities mainly rely on the income generated through the services offered, they actively seek patient’s satisfaction and do effort to provide a good quality of care. However, this reliance on the revenues generated by the facilities can lead to a high pressure for financial viability which in turn leads to increased costs for the patient. We identified some strategies that could mitigate the financial burden on the PCPs practices, but more information is needed to conclude on the suitability of these strategies.

#### Fulfilment of the PCP's personal needs

The PCPs of cases 4 and 7 had a very good satisfaction regarding the fulfillment of their personal needs. They both live in the community where there are working, and they are well-integrated in this community. They also have time for personal life activities and actively participates in community life (sport, coaching young people, etc.). As a result of their integration in the community they could build links more easily. However, while the PCP of case 7 is accessible almost every time, the accessibility of the PCP in case 4 is limited by other factors (his busy schedules or administrative duties for instance).

The PCPs of cases 1, 5, 6 and 8 have a good satisfaction regarding the fulfillment of their personal needs, but the positive and negative aspects differ from one PCP to another. PCP of case 1 has a lot of time for her personal life activities and is well-integrated in her work community. But she wants to embrace other professional activities (or have a specialty training). In the cases 5 and 8, the PCPs are happy and motivated to stay because they have their family leaving close to their workplace and they can regularly interact with them. But their busy schedule doesn’t give them enough time for their personal life activities. So, in these two cases having their family beside them increased their motivation to stay and focus on the work. As for the PCP of case 6, he is well integrated in the community he is working in and participates in many community activities. He reported being happy with that with a sense of belonging. However, he no longer lives in the community but in an adjacent city at about 1 hour from his workplace. This is because it is difficult for his family to leave in the town of his workplace. But this does not seem to impact any of the aspects of his performance as he still has good links with the community and offer care with a fairly good technical quality of care, a good patient-centeredness, a good continuity, etc.

PCPs of cases 2 and 3 have an average satisfaction regarding the fulfillment of their personal needs. Both have busy schedules. But while the case 2 is not well-integrated in the community she is working in, the PCPs of case two could build links with the community, even if it is not personal. The PCP of case 3 lives in an adjacent city at about 1 hour from his workplace (difficult for his family to leave in the town of his workplace). This decreases his availability, contrary to case 6.

Based on the comparisons made above, it appears that the fulfillment of the PCPs’ personal needs may increase their motivation and retention in the workplace, but we don’t have enough evidence to conclude that it improves their performance.

#### Regulation of the PCPs’ practices

In Benin, there are rules and laws that exist and regulate the practice of physicians and health workers in general. These include the medical code of ethics of February 1073, law N° 97-020 of 17th June 1997 and the decree N° 2018-034 of 31th January 2018, both regulating the private practice of health professionals, the law N° 2020-37 of 3rd February 2021 for the people’s health protection in Benin, and various decrees related to the health workers working in the public sector (including their work organization, remuneration, training, career advancement, etc.). There are several shortcomings in this regulation, when it comes to PCPs’ practices in Benin, most importantly the fact that these laws barely include the specificities related to the practice at primary care level. However, even if the literature indicates the existing regulation can influence the PCPs’ practices, we did not analyze this factor because the regulation does not differ from one case to another. Therefore, we would not be able to find differences among the cases.

#### Accountability mechanisms

In the cases 3, 4 and 8, there are clear accountability mechanisms from the PCPs to the health authorities. All 3 cases have a well-defined geographical area for which they are responsible of the achievement of key health indicators monitored in the national health plan. Moreover, the roles and the performance indicators expected from these PCPs are clearly defined in a job description document (usually produced by the district or regional health office). Apart from the key health indicators, other performance indicators include the existence and implementation of workplans, correct reporting, increase of the income generated by the health facility, maintenance of the health facility, and the satisfaction of the health facility’s users. Most of these indicators are oriented towards a good facility management and a good contribution to strengthening the local health system. They also request a good contact with the community actors. It is therefore not surprising to see that all 3 cases (3, 4, and 8) have a good performance in terms of community orientation and case’s contribution to strengthen the local health system. The users’ satisfaction indicator could force these cases to promote a good patient-centeredness and technical effectiveness. However, the routine health information system from which the PCPs’ performance indicators are derived usually don’t capture these aspects. Moreover, even if the PCPs of case 3, 4 and 8 are in theory accountable to the community, we could not objectify an impact of this type of accountability on the performance of these PCPs.

In the cases 6 and 7, the PCPs have their roles and responsibilities clearly stated in the MGC’s charter (signed by the MGCs, the health authorities, and the municipal authorities). These roles include the obligation to personally provide clinical care to the patients in a continuous basis, to manage the health care facility, to ensure the financial accessibility of their health services, to organize health promotion and health education activities, to ensure the attainment of key health targets, and to engage in the community development. The signature of this charter and the associative activities of the MGCs leads to a mutual accountability among peers. This mutual accountability supports the MGCs’ performance in technical quality, patient-centeredness, accessibility, and other dimensions, as we have objectivated in cases 6 and 7.

The MGC charter also states that the MGCs should contribute to the performance indicators set by the health authorities. Indeed, the cases 6 and 7 also are responsible of the health of the population in a well-defined geographical area and they regularly report the indicators to the DHMT. This supports the performance of case regarding community-engagement and contribution to strengthen the local health system. Finally, there is a good accountability towards the community (especially for case 6) where the local leaders provide regular feedback to the PCP about the costs of the services, the performance of primary care team as perceived by the population, etc. This feedback mechanism does not go as far as controlling the PCP, but the latter is encouraged to be proactive and to improve his performance.

The cases 1, 2, and 5 are accountable to the health authorities, but this is limited to administrative issues (for example, having the necessary authorization or stick to services included in this authorization). However, these cases don’t have a specific population or area of responsibility and they don’t have the pressure to achieve key health indicators. It is thus not surprising that their performance in terms of community orientation and contribution to strengthen the local health system is at best average. Moreover, the roles they are supposed to play are more a general knowledge (from the medical school and tacit knowledge) than specifically defined.

Nevertheless, we noted a form of accountability towards the patients in case 5. Indeed, those attending this health facility often chose to do so and have the means (money, knowledge, etc.) to choose other centers. This encourages the primary care team in case 5 to listen and be responsive to the patients' needs (thus encouraging patient-centered care) and to set high technical standards of care.

In summary, we can say that the existence of accountability mechanisms influences the performance of the PCPs. The dimensions of performance influenced depend on the expectations set for the PCPs and the possibility to properly assess the attainment of these expectations. When patients and the rest of the community members are empowered to hold the primary care teams accountable, it can positively influence the performance of the PCPs’ practices as it compensates the shortcomings of the accountability mechanisms put in place by the health authorities.

#### Collaboration with community leaders and other public official

PCPs and their teams in cases 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 actively maintain, as part of the role assigned to them, a good collaboration with municipal authorities, community leaders and other public officials (education, water, police, etc.). By participating to multisectoral dialogue platforms, the PCPs in these cases are able to better contribute to strengthen the local health system. Moreover, the collaboration with community leaders and other key stakeholders facilitates the organization of community activities and thus the community engagement. For example, the primary care team in the case 7 usually organizes health campaign activities together with the schoolteachers. This helps them to mutualize resources (staff and motorcycles for instance) and to mutually reinforce their credibility. They are also able to embrace topics classically not included in health campaigns such as the problematic used of chemical pesticides. Finally, the collaboration with key stakeholders helps the PCPs’ practices to have access to some resources. For examples, the municipalities donated the initial buildings for the health facilities in cases 6 and 7. In case 3, a private water company helped the facility having clean water.

In the case 1 and 2 where the community orientation and the contribution to the local health systems were less good, we did not find a strong collaboration with community leaders or other key stakeholders. In case 5, there is some collaboration with the key stakehoders but not as strongly as in cases 2, 4, 6, 7 and 8.

Based on the analysis above, we can conclude that the collaboration with community leaders and other key stakeholders can positively influence the performance of PCPs in terms of community orientation and contribution to strengthen the local health system. This collaboration can also help the PCPs’ practices to have access to some resources.

#### Relationship with the rest of the primary care team and leadership style of the PCPs

In all cases, the PCP is (officially or tacitly) seen by all types of stakeholders as the leader of the primary care team. However, we found three different types of relationships between the PCPs and the rest of the primary care team.

The first one is a very hierarchical relationship were the PCPs mainly give orders to the rest of the primary care team. We found a hierarchical relationship in cases 3, 5 and 8. In these cases, the hierarchical relationship goes hand in hand with a "command and control" style of leadership where the PCPs are very rigorous, and the primary care team is asked to stick to strict rules (for instance the ones edited by the Ministry of health for the cases in the public sector). The hierarchical relationship and command-and control style of leadership appear to negatively influence the PCP’s capacity to strengthen their primary care team in cases 3 and 8. In both cases, the PCP’s capacity to strengthen the primary care team and facility was average. In case 3, even though the PCP has a good individual performance, he was not able to bring his team to the same level of performance (especially in patient-centred care). The team would stick to the standards the PCP asks from them, but only when he is present in the facility. In case 8, the primary care team members just limit themselves to apply the standards set by the Ministry of health without necessarily seeking a better performance. In case 5, despite the hierarchical relationship and command-and control leadership style, the primary care team members were able to provide care according to the defined standards. We have therefore rated the PCP’s capacity to strengthen the primary care team and facility as good. However, the PCP in case 5 acknowledged that to obtain these results he regularly has to fire some team members.

The second type of relationship between the PCPs and the rest of the primary care team is a mere cordial relationship, with the PCPs and the rest of the primary care team working in silo. We found this type of relationships in cases 1 and 2. In these cases, the PCP and the rest of the primary care team cooperate around the patient care, but this cooperation is limited to sharing instructions or information and there is not a real teamwork. We observed that this type of relationship does not facilitate at all a transfer of knowledge from the physicians to the other health workers and vice versa. Therefore, this type of relationship decreases the PCPs’ capacity to strengthen the primary are team.

The third type of relationship is a relationship where there is a strong collaboration between the PCPs and the rest of the primary care team. We found this type of relationship in cases 6 and 7. In these cases, the PCPs still lead the team but there is a teamwork with team members supporting each other and sharing knowledge (rather than only instructions). Moreover, while also being rigorous, the PCPs in cases 6 and 7 adopt a person-centered approach in their leadership style. Consequently, they provide regular recognition to their staff for their efforts, clearly state what they expect from them (sometimes in a written way) and carry out activities aimed at fostering team spirit (football matches, participation in community events, etc.). This teamwork and person-centered leadership appear to positively influence the PCPs capacity to strengthen the primary care team. Indeed, we have noted in the primary care teams in cases 6 et 7 a real enthusiasm for work, a team spirit and a collective desire to provide a good quality of care.

In summary, a strong collaboration between the PCPs and the rest of the primary care team and person-centred leadership style from the PCPs help to promote teamwork, to share knowledge, and to have shared values among the team. This in turn positively influences the PCPs’ capacity to strengthen the capacity the primary care team. This strong collaboration may also support the whole primary care team performance in various dimensions, for instance patient-centeredness, because of the shared values and knowledge. A hierarchical relationship and a command-and-control style of leadership may work to strengthen the primary care team’s capacities, but only if the PCP has a control over the hiring of the primary care team members.

Finally, we found that the nurses-practitioners are allowed to provide curative consultations to the patients in cases 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8. When the nurse-practitioners see patients with conditions that are too complex for them to handle but not urgent enough for a referral to the district hospital, they refer these patients to the PCP. In the cases 1, 2 and 3, nurses-practitioners are not allowed to provide curative consultations to patients. Consequently, the cases 2 and 5, where the health facility is opened 24/7, need to ensure the cost of a physician (much higher than the cost of a nurse-practitioner) 24/7. This increases the costs of providing healthcare for the health facilities (and sometimes increases the costs for the patients). Moreover, having a physician in permanence may lead to inefficiencies if the number of patients needing to see a physician is not high enough. The average numbers of patients seen daily by the PCPs in our sample range from 4 to 10.

Therefore, allowing nurse-practitioners to provide patient care contributes to increase the accessibility of care for the population. This is achieved in two ways: the nurses can compensate for the absence of the physicians, and having nurses that consult reduces the number of physicians necessary, thus potentially reduce the cost for the facilities and the patients.

However, having nurse-practitioners providing care without the necessary capacity strengthening may decrease the performance of the overall practice, as we saw in cases 3 and 8.

#### Workload and availability of the PCP

In terms of patient care, the average numbers of patients seen daily by the PCPs in our sample was relatively low, ranging from 4 to 10. Therefore, it was difficult for us to appreciate a possible impact of the number of patients on the PCPs’ performance.

As for other activities, cases 3, 4, and 8 have limited availability for patient care because of the multiple responsibilities related to their role as the head of the health center and coordinator of all health activities in a given commune. This may negatively affect their accessibility to the population. However, this accessibility issue is balanced by the fact that they share responsibilities for patient care (including curative consultations) with nurse-practitioners. Case 6 and 7 have more availability for patients care but they also rely on nurses-practitioners for curative consultations during short absences, ensuring then the continuous availability of health services to the patients.

#### Contextual aspects

#### We found several contextual aspects in this analysis of the PCPs’ practices: insufficient financial capacities within the communities, urbanization level, ownership of the facility, and recurrent health systems issues such as a weak referral system or medicine stockout at national level. However, we found several examples where contextual elements influences the PCPs’ practices for two aspects specifically: the urbanization level and the ownership of the facility:

#### Regarding the rural or urban nature of the area where the PCPs are practicing, lab tests, branded medicines and private health insurances were found to be more available for the cases located in urban areas. This increases the availability of services but also provides more incentives for over prescription, as saw for some cases. Moreover, the competition with other centers tends to be higher in urban area, which led some of the cases to propose more and more diagnosis tests and sophisticated equipment to outdo other facilities. For instance, the case 5 is in an urban environment where there is strong competition with big polyclinics and thus a demand (from the patients and the health professional) for sophisticated equipment and diagnostic tests. This further decreases the case’s performance in terms of financial accessibility the high costs and there may be inefficiency and overmedicalization issues.

#### In rural areas, some factors may be easier to obtain because of the relatively small size of the community, such as a good collaboration with community leaders and other public officials. Cases 4, 6 and 7 for instance personally know all the key stakeholders and usually attend community activities with them. Also, a family-like relationship between the PCP and the rest of the care team appears easier to find in rural area than in urban area.

Regarding the ownership of the facility, we have seen that a "command and control" leadership style may work to make the primary care team respect some quality standards. However, this needs the PCP to have an effective pressure mean on the primary care workers (ex-case 5 who has control on the hiring of his staff) to make the latter follow the PCP’s orders. This pressure mean is more difficult to obtain in the public sector than in the private sector where the PCPs can be the owners of the facility.

Finally, we saw that when the community is empowered to hold the PCPs and their team accountable it may positively influence their performance. However, empowerment of the community comes from different sources, depending of the cases. In the cases 1 and 2, the community are empowered to hold the PCPs accountable. In case 5, the community’s power comes from their financial capability. In cases 6 and 7 the community power comes from the strength of their local leaders and the agreements the latter have with the PCPs. In cases 3 and 4, the situation is more ambiguous.