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Reviewer's report:

1. Abstract is redundant.

2. Background P3L20#“the prevalence of senile dementia in the 2000s tended to be falling as compared 21 with that of the 1980s” This sentence is miss-leading. The cited report showed decreased age-adjusted prevalence, but not prevalence. Indeed, prevalence increased in 2000s. The author should describe that this reduction of age-adjusted prevalence dues to prevention program.

3. P4L1: “Non-pharmacological interventions are an important 1 strategy for overcoming such a rapidly aging society” Is it possible to overcome aging society? To overcome aging society, average life span should be shorten, which is impossible.

4. P4L9: “For elderly people” should be “For mentally-normal elderly people”.

5. P4L22#P5L14#This part should be discussed in Discussion session. This part makes Background session redundant.

6. P7L5: Add how many times lecture was done for the control group.

7. P7L7: “each group” should be “both groups”.

8. P8L22: “the participants are asked to recall the contents of a story immediately after examiner tell the two stories” This is a wrong method, where examiner tells 2 stories, and then participant recalls 2 stories. In a right way, examiner tells one story and participant recalls the story, then examiner tells the next story. This is a critical point. If the method was wrong, this paper should be rejected.

9. P12L10#1) Definition of MCI appears here first. It should be described in Method session. 2) The authors used the score of MOA-J to detect MCI. This method is somewhat troublesome. The reason why they used this standard to define MCI should be described in the Discussion session.

10. P13L19-20: “Repeating these activities might positively influence acquisition of memorization strategies for the participants” Please cite reference for this part, if possible.

11. Fig 2 is incomplete. I recommend to make new table with format of the Table 2 to show the result of MCI participants, instead of Fig.2. If the authors want to
use Fig 2, number of subjects and p value should be added in the figure.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.