This manuscript explores prevalence of common risk factors and symptoms of mental health between the urban and non-urban inhabitants in Indonesia. The authors found that respondents living in urban area had higher scores in the risk factors: loneliness, bullying at home, and negative schema, and mental disorder symptoms: positive symptom and depression. Therefore, they conclude that living in urban might linked to higher exposure to mental health risk factor and more possible to having mental health problems. This manuscript is well-written but, in my opinion, incomplete. See below for some comments and questions:

1. Please provide page number to help the reviewers address specific comment/issue in the manuscript
2. 2.1. Participants and procedure: The definition of urban and non-urban in this study was not clearly defined. In the limitation section of discussion, the author mentioned about “in this study urbanicity was conceptualized as the current place of residence”. How was the current place of residence judged as urban or non-urban: government administration definition, respondent self-judged, etc?
3. Results – Participant characteristics: It’s better to provide a table of demographic characteristics of the participants. This will help the readers to understand easier the sample and level of representativeness. How many of this study sample was urban and non-urban? Some of the sentences in this part are not clear enough, for example: (i) Participants were significantly different in terms of age (t(680.460) = -4.11, p < .01), income (t(830) = -2.49, p < .05), education (U = 96,316.500, p < .01), and SES (U = 93,813.00, p < .05).. which participants was refereed in this result? (ii) which measures were being referred in “… with non-urban participants showing higher mean scores across measures than urban participants”?
4. 4.1. Main findings: “Participants living in the non-urban area were significantly older, had a higher level of income, education, as well as socio-economic status.” I find this as strange and unlikely! Could you elaborate more about this?
5. 3.2. Urban and non-urban differences: t-tests or Mann-Whitney U test was applied comparing each variable between the two groups. Would it better if this comparison also controlling for sociodemographic factors; i.e. gender, education, SES since the two samples were significantly different in terms of sociodemographic factors? Furthermore, the authors have the risk factors, groups (urban vs non-urban), and the symptoms of mental disorders: why not model them and see whether the place of residence plays a significant role?
6. 3.2. Urban and non-urban differences: The statistically significance differences between urban and non-urban found in this study should be seen in the light of the statistical power of almost 1000 respondents. As can be seen, all the significant differences effect sizes were small: 0.14-0.25. This should be mentioned in the result and discussion section.
7. Limitation: The possibility of access to internet, hence to enrolled n this study, is higher in urban area than rural. Would this be considered as a possible bias?
8. Conclusion: In my opinion, the conclusion of “living in an urban environment is one risk factor contributing to a poorer mental health condition” is too strong considering the simple descriptive analysis as conducted in the present manuscript.