

Quick Guide to Green Open Access

This guide helps you to make your research publications open access when you **have not** published with an open access publisher or otherwise paid for open access.

Green open access means self-archiving a version of your article in Pure or another repository. According to the SDU Open Science Policy you are strongly encouraged to archive your accepted manuscript version in Pure.¹ As a SDU affiliate the easiest way to share your manuscript is to send manuscript and relevant tables and figures to puresupport@bib.sdu.dk.

What is an accepted manuscript?

→ An accepted manuscript is a peer reviewed manuscript of your article. When the manuscript is ultimately accepted after peer review corrections, your latest version is the accepted manuscript. This can be a word document you have on your computer.

If you make sure to save your final manuscript with a clear file name when it is accepted, it is easy to find it later.

Introduction

Why be concerned about inequality? Much recent theorizing and empirical investigation of the politics and social dynamics of inequality has either failed to successfully address or answer this question. Why is it that we consider more inequality bad and less inequality good? On this question, contemporary inequality scholars find themselves in somewhat of a dilemma. On the one hand, it seems that our concern with inequalities does not stem from relative differences *per se*, but is derived rather from our moral disturbance with underlying poverty (Feldstein 1999).

But on the other hand, we often find ourselves troubled by significant inequalities even in the absence of any absolute poverty (Atkinson 2015; Kenworthy 2008). Consequently, scholars of political inequality are on shaky ground when it comes to the explaining of their theoretical grounds for concern with inequality, and the standard move is to set aside the normative part of this question and to justify the concern with inequality merely on the negative consequences of large economic inequalities for society as a whole (Jensen and Van Kersbergen 2016; Wilkinson and Pickett 2010; Kenworthy 2008). Despite that this might well be enough to justify political action to reduce inequality this standard move is theoretically inadequate. It does not explain, on a consistent normative or empirical account, our strong concern with inequality.

This article offers a way out of this dilemma for scholars of inequality. It bridges normative political theorizing and empirically informed perspectives on political inequality and thereby offers a coherent account of why we care about inequality. More specifically, it elaborates a political aspirating version of the sufficiency view—indebted to the theorizing of Harry Frankfurt (1987; 2015) and Roger Crisp (2003)—and applies this view to the set of reasons given in the empirical literature to oppose inequality. Thus, importantly, it is not the aim of this article to argue that inequalities are not morally problematic, or to argue that our political

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

- 1 Dermal uptake and percutaneous penetration of organophosphate esters in a human skin *ex vivo* model
- 2 Marie Frederiksen^{1,2,*}, Heather M. Stapleton³, Katrin Vorkamp⁴, Thomas F. Webster⁵, Niels Martin Jensen⁶,
- 3 Jens Alnø Sørensen⁷, Flemming Nielsen⁸, Lisbeth E. Knudsen⁹, Lars S. Sørensen¹⁰, Per Ael Clausen¹¹, and
- 4 Jørgen B. Nielsen¹².
- 5
- 6 ¹ Danish Building Research Institute, Aalborg University, A.C. Meyers Vang 15, 2400 Copenhagen SV, Denmark
- 7 ² National Research Centre for the Working Environment, Lerche Parkalle 105, 2100 Copenhagen Ø
- 8 ³ Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, LSRB Box 90328, Durham, NC 27708, USA
- 9 ⁴ Department of Environmental Science, Aarhus University, Frederiksborgvej 399, 8000 Roskilde, Denmark
- 10 ⁵ Department of Environmental Health, Boston University School of Public Health, 715 Albany St, Boston MA 02118, USA
- 11 ⁶ Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Odense University Hospital, Sdr. Boulevard 29, 5000 Odense C, Denmark
- 12 ⁷ Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, J.B. Winsløws Vej 98, 5000 Odense C, Denmark
- 13 ⁸ Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, Øster Farimagsgade 5A, 2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark
- 14 ⁹ Corresponding author:
- 15 Marie Frederiksen, mfr@rivm.nl, tel.: +45 39 16 52 00
- 16 Present addresses:
- 17 ¹⁸ Department of Civil Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Broyvej, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

Click the links here to see additional accepted manuscripts:

- [HUM](#)
- [NAT](#)
- [SAMF](#)
- [SUND](#)
- [TEK](#)

¹ <https://www.sdu.dk/-/media/files/bibliotek/sdu+open+science+policy-09032018.pdf>

Most journals allow you to upload an early version of your article to your institutional repository.

How and when an accepted manuscript can be uploaded is most times part of the publisher's standard policy. This is also included in the copyright transfer agreement you sign with the publisher.

If you are not the corresponding author of the publication it can be necessary to contact one of your co-authors to obtain the final manuscript version.

Once you have located the peer reviewed manuscript, we recommend that you send it to the Pure Office while stating that it is the peer reviewed manuscript you are sending.

What happens after I send my manuscript to the Pure office?

At SDU the Pure office makes sure to examine the conditions that exists for sharing through Pure with the exact journal you have published with. They will also correctly upload your manuscript.

Your manuscript will most times be subject to an embargo period. This means that we will upload your manuscript to Pure at once but public access to the document is given later. The embargo period can vary greatly.

If you have questions regarding Open Access and Pure or would like to know which of your articles you can pursue green open access with we are ready to help at puresupport@bib.sdu.dk.

The Pure Office SDU

Puresupport@bib.sdu.dk / T 6550 2430

May 25, 2021