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Dear Sir/Madam

On behalf of my colleague and myself, I would like to re-submit the revised manuscript of the debate article “The MacGyver Effect: Alive and well in health services research?”, for your approval.

Thank you for your email of 11 July 2011. Overall the reviewer’s comments were very positive and affirmed the importance of this paper. The reviewer made some specific suggestions for improving the paper which we have responded to, as itemised below.

1. Additional information about the television character MacGyver has been included in the introductory paragraph. Linking arguments to the MacGyver analogy have been strengthened throughout the paper, and within the examples.

2. The paper has been re-worded, particularly in the ‘Background’ section, and in the concluding remarks, to provide greater clarity as requested with respect to the purpose of the paper and examples, and contribution to research practice.

3. The ‘Background’ section has also been reworked to provide clarification of the genesis and relevance of the 3 drivers noted in the paper. Acknowledgement of existing literature on organisational culture and time pressures has been made in the text and in the references. We have also reworked the paper to make more explicit the supporting arguments for issues noted.

4. Throughout the ‘Discussion’ section the perspective from which the tensions and challenges are considered has been clarified.
5. The examples have been revised according to the reviewer’s suggestions, and additional introductory explanations for each of the examples have been included in the text.

6. The section entitled “Innovation to maintain relevance” has been re-crafted. Paragraphs on “So what would MacGyver do” within the discussion of challenges, also address potential MacGyver type solutions to the issues raised.

Revisions to the manuscript have been highlighted with ‘tracked changes’.

With regard to additional Editor’s comments, and other editorial requirements

A Competing interests section has been included.

The structure of the manuscript has been checked to ensure it follows the structure for a Debate article for BMC Health Services Research.

Figure titles for all figures have been listed after the references in the manuscript.

With thanks

Yours truly

Roshan Perera