VOLUME - 12, ISSUE - 04, APRIL - 2023 • PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8160 • DOI : 10.36106/gjra

Original Research Paper

Ophthalomology

# of Thernational

CLINICAL EVALUATION OF INTRAOCULAR PRESSURE MEASUREMENTS USING DIFFERENT TONOMETERS IN PATIENTS OF VARIOUS REFRACTIVE ERRORS

Dr Sonalee Mittal	PROF & HOD, Department Of Ophthalmology, Index Medical College, Indore
Dr Ashwini Kumar Singh Parihar*	Post Graduate Resident, Index Medical College, Indore *Corresponding Author
Dr Gauri Swami	Post Graduate Resident, Index Medical College, Indore

Background: Intraocular pressure (IOP)is an important first indicator of probability and suspicion of ABSTRACT Glaucoma. The virtual IOP status is grossly influenced by multiple factors including Refractive errors , corneal biomechanics , central corneal thickness (CCT) and Scleral rigidity. Aim: To compare relative IOP measurements and its variability in Emmetropes, myopic and hypermetropic patients using Schiotz, Goldmann Applanation(GAT) and I-Care Rebound tonometer to establish an equation between virtual and real time IOP. Materials and Methods: This observational prospective study comprised of 100 subjects above the age of 18 years inclusive37 Emmetropes , 31 Hypermetropes and remaining 32 belonged to myopia . Statistical Analysis : Descriptive statistics were performed using SPSS for Windows version 17.0 to calculate the demographic characteristics of the study cohort. The data were expressed as mean values including the standard deviation (SD) and the 95% confidence interval (CI). Mean IOP measurements between Schiotz, I-Care and GAT were compared by One way ANOVA along with Individual pair wise comparison by applying Post Hoc Tukey Test for comparison of IOP measurements using a particular method of Tonometry in individuals of myopia, hypermetropia and emmetropia. Results: The highest mean value of CCT 536.667 mum was in Hypermetropes whereas the lowest CCT value of 507.031 mum was in myopic eyes with statistically significant (P<0.05). The mean value for IOP in Emmetropes was16.665 mm Hg for Schiotz , 15.027 Hg for GAT and 15.081 mm Hg for I–Care .Whereas Hypermetropes revealed mean value of 15.055 mm Hg for Schiotz , 14.323 mm Hg for GAT and 14.065 mm Hg for I –Care . The mean value for IOP in Myopic eyes was 16.875 mm Hg for Schiotz , 14.375 mm Hg for GAT and 14.688 mm Hg for I-Care . Conclusion : The study had revealed higher mean value of IOP in Myopic eyes as compare to Emetropic and Hypermetropic subjects. IOP measurements by the Schiotz tonometer were significantly higher as compare to GAT and I-Care tonometer. Whereas recordings by GAT and I Care tonometers were almost in agreement .Definitive correlation could not be established between pachymetry readings and adjusted IOP following GAT and I-Care tonometry.

**KEYWORDS :** Correlation of IOP and refractive errors , comparison of efficacy of Schiotz, Goldmann Applanation and I-CARE Rebound tonometer .IOP in Myopia .Correlation of CCT and IOP

# INTRODUCTION

Measurement of Intraocular pressure (IOP) is an integral component of any Ocular examination as well as the very first indicator of probability and suspicion of Glaucoma.

There are numerous methods and tonometers are available to record Intra IOP (1,2). Schiotz Tonometer remained as a standard portable tool for the purpose of quick recording of IOP despite its limitations in the consistency and factors like scleral rigidity(1).

The Noncontact tonometer has replaced Schiotz tonometer as a screening tool and general OPD protocol but it has significant inconsistency in results.(2) However Goldman Applanation tonometer(GAT)remained a Gold Standard due to its high accuracy and precision despite constraints of need of Slit lamp and use of Fluorescein Dye to stain Cornea. Ocular Response Analyser, Corvis ST(3,4) followed by I-Care rebound tonometer(1,2) are newer modalities in the field of IOP measurement .I-Care rebound tonometer is gaining wide attention as it is easy to use ,portable and non contact technology that to without using any dye to stain cornea.(1,2)

The real IOP status is grossly influenced by multiple factors including existing Refractive errors ,corneal biomechanics ,central corneal thickness(CCT) and Scleral rigidity. (5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14) Over and above ,virtual IOP recorded by different methods are invariably influenced by such factors . Hence it is very difficult to have absolute accuracy in IOP recordings by any method . There for this study was undertaken to compare outcome of IOP recording by different methods in prevailing refractive errors so as to establish an optimal equilibrium between virtual and real time IOP clubbed with maximum precision.

To the best of our knowledge, the present study is a maiden attempt to compare and evaluate the efficacy of Schiotz ,Goldmann Applanation and I–Care rebound tonometer in all three refractive status including Emetropia ,Hypermetropia and Mypoia in the non glaucomatous Central Indian population.

Materials and Methods :This observational prospective study was comprised of 100 subjects of both sexes and above the age of 18 years inclusive of 37 Emmetropes , 31 Hypermetropes and remaining 32 were having myopic refractive errors.

The exclusion criteria were, any subject below the age of 18years, known history of Glaucoma, any previous corneal surgery including refractive surgery, Scarred or Hazycorneas, Microphthalmos, Blepharospasm, Manifest Nystagmus, Keratoconus .Eyes associated with any active conjunctival or corneal infections were also excluded .

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Institution.

# Study Design

Detailed ophthalmic examination including assessment of visual acuity , refractive errors , anterior and posterior segment evaluation was essentially carried out in all subjects .

Central corneal thickness (CCT) was measured by a solid-tip, ultrasonic pachymeter. After installation of a drop of 0.5% proparacaine hydrochloride, nine readings were performed in rapid succession and the average value was recorded.

The IOP measurement was performed in supine position for

Schiotz Tonometer, where as in sitting position for GAT and I-CARE rebound tonometry in the sequence of I-CARE and GAT followed by Schiotz tonometry. All the instruments were regularly calibrated according to the manufacturers' instructions. A 10min break was set between each IOP measurement to minimize after-measurement fluctuations in the IOP.

In case of Schiotz Tonometer , Three consecutive measurements within 2 mm Hg on each eye were performed. In case of any deviation of more than 2 mm Hg in the readings, another measurement was obtained. The average of three final measurements was taken for analysis. During the I-Care measurement, a disposable, single-use probe was loaded into the device and aligned 4-8 mm perpendicular to the central cornea. Six consecutive measurements were performed. The software automatically discarded the highest and the lowest values, and the IOP was calculated from the remaining four values. Only proper measurements(the green back ground indicating within reasonable limits)were accepted. GAT was performed with the Goldmann applanation device mounted on a slit-lamp biomicroscope. After installation of a drop of 0.25% fluorescein with 0.5% proparacaine hydrochloride, in each eye, three sequential measurements were performed and the average value of three measurements were documented.

### **Statistical Analysis**

Descriptive statistics were performed to calculate the demographic characteristics of the study cohort. The data were expressed as mean values including the standard deviation (SD) and the 95% confidence interval (CI).Mean IOP measurements between Schiotz, I-Care and GAT were compared by One way ANOVA along with Individual pair wise Juxtaposition by applying Post Hoc Tukey Test for comparison of IOP measurements using a particular method of Tonometry in case of myopia, hypermetropia and emmetropia.

Values were considered significant if p values were less than 0.05 and non significant if p values were more than 0.05.

All analysis were performed using SPSS for Windows version 17.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL)

#### RESULTS

Of these 100 subjects ,37( 37%) Emmetropes ,31(31%) Hypermetropic and remaining 32(32%) were Myopic all inclusive 51% females and 49% males respectively.

Table 1: Comparison Of Mean IOPVariable By Schiotz, GAT
And I-care Methods In All Three Refractive Status

Refractive	Schiotz	Goldmann	I-Care (in
error	tonometer (in	Applanation	mm Hg)
	mm Hg)	(in mm Hg)	
Emmetropia	16.665	15.027	15.081
Myopia	16.875	14.375	14.688
Hypermetropia	15.055	14.323	14.065

The mean value for IOP by the Schiotz tonometer was highest among all three methods of IOP measurement with in all subjects inclusive Emmetropic, Myopes and Hypermetropes. Whereas readings of GAT and I- Care were in agreement with insignificant Pvalue.

## Table 2: Comparison Of Mean IOP Variable Among Applanation & Schiotz Methods.

Variable	Method	Ν	Mean	Std.	Т	Р	Result
				Dev	Test	Value	
IOP	APPLANATION	100	14.600	3.002	3.	0.001	Sig
	SCHIOTZ	100	16.073	3.366	266		

Table 2, represented the comparison of mean IOP variable among Applanation & Schiotz methods.T-test was applied to

compare the difference between the mean value of IOP among different methods which was found to be statistically significant (P < 0.05). The mean value 14.600 of applanation method was significantly lower than the mean value 16.073 of Schiotz method.

Table 3: Comparison Of Mean IOP Variable Among GAT & I-	
care Methods.	

Variable	Method	Ν	Mean	Std. Dev	T Test	P Value	Result
IOP	GAT	100	14.600	3.002	0.098	0.922	Non
	I-Care	100	14.640	2.758			Sig

Table 03, showed the comparison of mean IOP variable among GAT & I-Care methods. T-test was applied to compare the difference between the mean value of IOP among different methods which was found to be statistically non-significant (P>0.05). The mean value 14.600 of GAT method was nonsignificantly lower than the mean value 14.640 of I-Care method.

Table 04 : Comparison Of Mean IOP Variable Among Schiotz & I-care Methods

Variable	Method	Ν	Mean	Std.	T Test	P Value	Result
				Dev			
IOP	SCHIOTZ	100	16.073	3.366	-3.712	0.000	Sig
	ICARE	100	14.640	2.758			

Table 5 :Comparison Of Mean Value Of Pachymeter Among Different Groups

Vari-	Groups	N	Mean	Std.	F	Р	Re-
αble				Dev	Test	Value	sult
				24.3237		0.	Sig
meter	Hypermetropia	31	536.677	33.4797	3350	000	
	Emmetropia	37	525.541	29.1782			
	Total	100	523.070	31.2718			

The table No.5 had shown the mean comparison of mean value of Pachymeter among three different groups. One way ANOVA test was applied to compare the difference between the mean value of three groups .The highest mean value of CCT 536.667 mum was in Hypermetropes whereas the lowest CCT value of 507.031mum was in myopic eyes with statistically significant (P<0.05). Whereas comparison in hypermetropia with Emmetropia was statistically nonsignificant (P>0.05).

The individual pair wise comparison of all three groups was done by applying Post Hoc Tukey Test.

Table	6	:Post	HOC	Tukey	Test:	The	Individual	Pair	Wise
Comp	ar	ison C	of All T	hree <b>G</b> i	roups				

Depend	Dependent Variable			Std.	Р	Re-
			Diff	Error	Value	sult
PACHY- METER	Μγορία	Hyper- metropia	-29.646*	7.355	0.000	Sig
		Emmetropia	-18.509*	7.045	0.027	Sig
	Hyper- metropia	Emmetropia	11.137	7.106	0.265	Non Sig

In the above pairwise post hoc comparisons, the pair myopia and hypermetropia, pair myopia with hypermetropia & emmetropia was statistically significant (P<0.05)whereas hypermetropia with emmetropia was statistically nonsignificant (P>0.05).

# Table 7 :comparison Of Mean Value Of Adjusted IOP Among Different Groups

	<b>-</b>						
Variable	Groups	Ν	Mean	Std.	F	Р	Result
				Dev	Test	Value	
Adjusted	Myopia	32	17.406	3.499	1.089	0.341	Non
IOP	Hyper-	31	15.014	2.579			Sig
	metropia						

	VOLUME - 12, ISSUE - 04,	APRIL - 2023 • PRINT ISSN No.	2277 - 8160 • DOI : 10.36106/gjra
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------

	Iotai	100	10.101	0.020		-
	Total	100	16 401	3 026		
	Emmetropia	37	16.784	3.001		

The above table depicted the comparison of mean value of Adjusted IOP among three different groups.

One way ANOVA test was applied to compare the difference between the mean value of three groups which was found out to be statistically non-significant (P>0.05)

The mean value of Myopia, 17.870 was highest whereas the lowest value 15.014 was for hypermetropia.

The individual pair wise comparison of adjusted IOP in all three groups was done by applying Post Hoc Tukey Test. The mean difference between Myopia and Hypermetropia was 0.465 (P Value 0.818), Myopia and Emetropia was 0.622(P Value 0.676). Where as mean difference between Hypermetropia and Emetropia was 1.087 (P Value 0.313). Hence the difference was non -significant among all three groups (P>0.05).

## DISCUSSION

Intraocular pressure (IOP)is a very significant indices of probability and suspicion of Glaucoma. The real time IOP recordings are grossly influenced by multiple factors including status of Refractive errors ,Central corneal thickness(CCT), Scleral rigidity as well as of Corneal biomechanics (4,12,13,14).

A large number of studies have identified strong link between IOP and CCT well as with the refractive errors (4,5,6,11,12, 13,14,15). Role of CCT and Scleral rigidity in terms of variability between Virtual and Real time IOP have been very most significant marker to re-adjust virtual IOP readings to correlate with real IOP following measurement of IOP by any method.

In addition to sclera rigidity and CCT, Corneal hysteresis ( CH) and Corneal resistance factor (CRF) may act as a pressure independent probable parameter for the evaluation of the status of Glaucoma . CH and CRF values are known to be altered in cases of glaucoma or as a consequences of Refractive laser procedures.(14,15,16).1 to 2 mm lower values of CH and CRF have been documented in case of primary Open Angle Glaucoma (POAG) as compare to the normal eyes. where as higher values than normal eyes are documented in case of Ocular Hypertension and Angle closure glaucoma (13,14).

Ocular response analyser (ORA) have been found to be an effective instrument to assess CH and CRF and to measure IOP with better accuracy(15,16,17).

It is being considered that CRF may reshape readings of GAT irrespective of quantum of CCT(13). Where as I Care rebound tonometer is less affected by the CRF(17,18).

Since data obtained from ORA, GAT and I- Care holds wide spectrum and deviation of pattern ,a scientific inter changeability of IOP values of GAT and ORA or I-Care with ORA are adversely compounded and create practical difficulty to establish clinical parity among all three methods as observed by other researcher also. (15,17,18) As the IOP evaluation by ORA was not the part of protocol of our study, we could not validate the efficacy of ORA in terms of CH and CRF as well as comparative evaluation of clinical observations obtained from ORA with GAT or with I-Care rebound tonometer.

The quantum of CCT was grossly influenced by the status and type of refractive error.In our study ,the highest mean value of CCT was 536.667 mum observed in Hypermetropes whereas the lowest CCT value of 507.031mum was documented in myopic eyes with statistically significant difference (P<0.05). Where as the mean value of CCT was 525.541 micron in Emmetropic eyes .The mean value for IOP by the Schiotz tonometer was highest among all three methods of IOP measurement with in all subjects inclusive Emmetropic, Myopes and Hypermetropes. Whereas readings of GAT and I- Care were in agreement with insignificant P value.

Hence I-Care rebound tonometer can be effectively used in practice with reasonable consistency of the IOP values . However a definitive correlation could not be established between pachymetry readings and adjusted IOP following GAT and I-Care tonometry.

## CONCLUSION

The study had revealed higher levels of mean IOP in Myopia as compared to Hypermetropic and Emetropic eyes recorded by all three tonometers.

Among all three tonometers ,Schiotz tonometry readings were consistently higher as compare to values obtained from GAT and I-Care tonometer in all cases. Where as the IOP values recorded by GAT were statistically in significantly lower as compare to the readings recorded by I Care rebound tonometer .Definitive correlation could not be established between pachymetry readings and adjusted IOP following GAT and I-Care tonometry.

Hence I-Care tonometry can be a useful tool for accurate and quick assessment of IOP without using Slit lamp and fluorescein Dye.

## Merits And Limitations Of The Study

To the best of our knowledge, the present study is a maiden attempt to compare and evaluate the efficacy of Schiotz ,GoldmannApplantion and I –Care rebound tonometer in all three refractive status including Emetropia ,Hypermetropia and Mypoia among the Central Indian population.

The sample size being small and few odd participants with high degree of myopia and hypermetropia who had to be excluded from the study were some of the limitations of the study. More conclusive results would have been obtained with a larger sample size. Corneal biomechanical parameters were not evaluated in our study, which may interact with IOP measurement.

## REFERENCES

- Senthil S, Chary R, Ali MH, Choudhari N, Badakere S, Krishnamurthy R, Dikshit S, Garudadri C. Schiotz Scleral Intraocular Pressure Readings Predict Goldmann Applanation Readings Better Than Rebound Tonometry. Cornea. 2019 Sep;38(9):1117-1123. doi: 10.1097/ICO. 00000000002033. PMID: 31206396.
- Chen M, Zhang L, Xu J, Chen X, Gu Y, Ren Y, Wang K. Comparability of three intraocular pressure measurement: I-Care pro rebound, non-contact and Goldmann applanation tonometry in different IOP group. BMC Ophthalmol. 2019 Nov 14;19(1):225. doi: 10.1186/s12886-019-1236-5. PMID: 31726999; PMCID: PMC6857285.
- Ramm L, Herber R, Spoerl E, Raiskup F, Pillunat LE, Terai N. Intraocular Pressure Measurement Using Ocular Response Analyzer, Dynamic Contour Tonometer, and Scheimpflug Analyzer Corvis ST J Ophthalmol. 2019 Oct 16;2019:3879651. doi: 10.1155/2019/3879651. PMID: 31737355; PMCID: PMC6815996.
- Karmiris E, Tsiripidis K, Gartaganis PS, Totou S, Vasilopoulou MG, Patelis A, Giannakis I, Chalkiadaki E. Comparison of intraocular pressure obtained by Goldmann applanation tonometer, Corvis ST and an air puff tonometer in healthy adults. Eur J Ophthalmol. 2021 Dec 27:11206721211069227. doi: 10.1177/11206721211069227. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34955039.
- Nomura H, Ando F, Niino N, Shimokata H, Miyake Y. The relationship between intraocular pressure and refractive error adjusting for age and central corneal thickness. Ophthalmic Physiol Opt. 2004 Jan;24(1):41-5. doi: 10.1046/j.1475-1313.2003.00158.x. PMID: 14687200.
- Ma D, Wei S, Sun Y, Li SM, An WZ, Hu JP, Cao K, Yang XH, Lin CX, Guo JY, Li H, Fu J, Wang N. Distribution of IOP and its relationship with refractive error and other factors: the Anyang University Students Eye Study. Int J Ophthalmol. 2021 Apr 18;14(4):554-559. doi: 10.18240/ijo.2021.04.12. PMID: 33875947; PMCID: PMC8025177.
- Mimouni M, Flores V, Shapira Y, Graffi S, Levartovsky S, Sela T, Munzer G, Kaiserman I. Correlation between central corneal thickness and myopia. Int

Ophthalmol. 2018 Dec; 38(6):2547-2551. doi: 10.1007/s10792-017-0766-1. Epub 2017 Oct 26. PMID: 29075941.

- Jonas JB, Wang YX, Dong L, Panda-Jonas S. High Myopia and Glaucoma-Like Optic Neuropathy. Asia Pac J Ophthalmol (Phila). 2020 May-Jun;9(3):234-238. doi: 10.1097/APO.00000000000288. PMID: 32459697; PMCID: PMC7299230.
- Sng CC, Ang M, Barton K. Central corneal thickness in glaucoma. Curr Opin Ophthalmol. 2017 Mar;28(2):120-126. doi: 10.1097/ICU.00000000000335. PMID: 27764022.
- Burvenich H, Sallet G, De Clercq J. The correlation between IOP measurement, central corneal thickness and corneal curvature. Bull Soc Belge Ophtalmol. 2000;276:23-6. PMID: 10925524.
- 11. EhlersN,BramsenT,SperlingS.Applanation tonometry and central corneal thickness. Acta Ophthalmol 1975;53:34.PubMed GoogleScholar
- Whitacre MM, Stein RA, Hassanein K. The effect of corneal thickness on applanation tonometry Am J Ophthalmol 1993;115:5926.PubMed ,Google Scholar.
- Kaushik S, Pandav SS, Banger A, Aggarwal K, Gupta A. Relationship between corneal biomechanical properties, central corneal thickness, and intraocular pressure across the spectrum of glaucoma. Am J Ophthalmol. 2012 May; 153(5):840-849.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2011.10.032. Epub 2012 Feb 4. PMID: 22310080.
- Dascalescu D, Corbu C, Vasile P, Iancu R, Cristea M, Ionescu C, Radu Constantin C, Voinea L. The importance of assessing corneal biomechanical properties in glaucoma patients care - a review. Rom J Ophthalmol. 2016 Oct-Dec;60(4):219-225. PMID: 29450353; PMCID: PMC5711285.
- Pluháček F, Unzeitigová A, Marešová K, Rybá J. Influence of comea on intraocular pressure measurement by ICARE PRO and ORA. Cesk Slov Oftalmol. 2019 Summer;75(3):111-118. English. doi: 10.31348/2019/3/1. PMID: 31779459.
- Terai N, Raiskup F, Haustein M, Pillunat LE, Spoerl E. Identification of biomechanical properties of the cornea: the ocular response analyzer. Curr Eye Res. 2012 Jul;37(7):553-62. doi: 10.3109/02713683.2012.669007. Epub 2012 May 4. PMID: 22559332.
- Vandewalle E, Vandenbroeck S, Stalmans I, Zeyen T. Comparison of ICare, dynamic contour tonometer, and ocular response analyzer with Goldmann applanation tonometer in patients with glaucoma. Eur J Ophthalmol. 2009 Sep-Oct; 19(5):783-9. doi: 10.1177/112067210901900516. PMID: 19787588.
- Moreno-MontanesJ, Martinez-de-la-CasaJM, SabaterAL, Morales-Fernandez L, Saenz C, Garcia-Feijoo J. Clinical evaluation of the new rebound Tono meters I care PRO and Icare ONE compared with the Goldmannton on meter. J Glaucoma. 2015;24(7):527–532.doi: 10.1097/IJG.000000000000058. [PubMed][CrossRef][GoogleScholar]