

**Supplemental file 2 – Quality checklist and assessment**

Component	Comments/Clarification
1. Were the assessors/data analysts blinded?	Yes: Blinding was performed and adequately described. No: Blinding is not mentioned and/or experiments were always performed in the same order or the process was insufficiently described
2. Was the preparation checked for stability and quality?	Yes: The study included an endothelium/smooth muscle check or similar and investigated the stability of the preparation over time (if applicable) No: Either checks were not described, or checks were performed, but its consequences were not defined
3. Did the authors verify the intervention?	Yes: PO <sub>2s</sub> or P <sub>a</sub> O <sub>2s</sub> were measured and reported No: Neither were measured or reported
4. Did the authors verify temperatures, pH and CO <sub>2</sub> ?	Yes: Target values were provided and measured for all three properties No: One or more values were not reported Unclear: Target values were reported, but it was unclear whether or how they were measured
5. Was there no selective outcome reporting?	Yes: There was no indication for selective outcome reporting No: An effect was described, but no data was shown
6. Were the animal characteristics properly described?	Yes: The authors mentioned species, age/weight, gender and the number of animals used No: The authors did not describe one or more of the above characteristics
7. Were the vessels properly described?	Yes: The method of artery selection (e.g. order, standardized location), number of vessels per animal used and its diameter were reported No: The authors did not describe the above characteristics
8. Were group sized based on a power analysis?	Yes: A proper power analysis was described No: A power analysis was not described or mentioned
9. Is the study published in a peer reviewed journal?	Yes/No
10. Was the study approved by an ethical board?	Yes/No
11. Is there a conflict of interest statement?	Yes/No