Comparison of Noncontact Tonometer with Goldmann Appplanation Tonometer for Intraocular Pressure Measurement in Non-Glaucomatous Patients in Central India.

Introduction:
Intraocular pressure is an important ocular parameter that has significant influence in the diagnosis, development and management of glaucoma. [1, 2] Glaucoma is a leading cause of irreversible blindness worldwide.

Goldmann Appplanation tonometer is inferred from the force required to flatten (applanate) constant area (3.06 mm) of the cornea as per the Imbert-Fick law. [3] Surface anesthesia is required. It is considered to be gold standard test and is the most suitable and reliable method for measuring IOP, whereas NCT is a suitable method for community or mass screenings of IOP. The present work compares IOP measurements obtained by NCT with IOP measurements obtained by GAT in non-glaucomatous patients and to see if how well NCT compares to GAT.

Subjects and Methods:
The IOP readings were taken in a total of 300 patients (total 597 eyes) using both NCT and GAT. The study was performed at general hospital in central India. Simple random sampling method was used for selecting patients with inclusion and exclusion criteria mentioned below.

Inclusion criteria:
- Male and female patients in equal proportion
- Patients older than 16 years and less than 80 years
- Patients willing to give written informed consent

Exclusion criteria:
- Patients with history of glaucoma
- Patients with IOP readings more than 26 on NCT

The clinical evaluation of NCT was done by B Shridhar Rao. [7] This study was designed to evaluate the NCT in glaucomatous and non-glaucomatous patients and to compare these IOP readings with that of GAT. He observed that patient’s acceptance of NCT is good and stated that the NCT can be considered as a valuable screening device and can be used routinely for measuring IOP in all patients. As per study done by Farhood QK, there is a significant difference in the measurements of IOP between GAT and NCT. [8] The study indicated that measurements of IOP by NCT are usually higher than those obtained by GAT regardless of the patient’s age, sex, or laterality of eyes. He concluded that GAT remains the most suitable and reliable method for measuring IOP, whereas NCT is a suitable method for community or mass screenings of IOP. The present work compares IOP measurements obtained by NCT with IOP measurements obtained by GAT in non-glaucomatous patients and to see if how well NCT compares to GAT.
Detail history taken including HTN, DM, and other illnesses. Visual acuity was taken by Snellns chart. Autorefractometer readings were taken. Refraction was done. Patient was examined on slit lamp for detail anterior segment evaluation. Fundus examination was done using 90D.

IOP reading was first taken with NCT to avoid direct corneal contact and its influence on IOP readings. Procedure was explained and position was given to the patients with chin adjustment. The mean of three readings was considered (default setting of instrument).

The IOP measurement in same patients was carried out using GAT after a gap of 10 minutes. Proparacain 0.5% drops instilled. Fluorescein staining was done by fluorescein strip. IOP measured in cobalt blue filter uniocularly. The mean of three readings was considered.

Central corneal thickness measured with pachymeter. Blood pressure was taken by BP apparatus.

Results:
There were 159 female patients (53%) and 141 (47%) male patients. The mean age for all of 300 patients was 45.61 ± 16.62 years (range 17 to 83). Three patients had one eye (two phthisis bulbi, one staphyloma) so total of 597 eyes were considered for study. The mean IOP as measured by NCT was 14.73 ± 2.68 mm of Hg (range 6 to 26) whereas the mean IOP as measured by GAT was 2.65 mm of Hg (range 8 to 23). The mean CCT was 522.37 µm ± 34.36 (range 427 to 614). Refer Table 1.

Student’s t-test was performed for assessing the statistical significance of the difference between two sample means of IOP reading obtained by NCT and GAT. The p value was found to be less than 0.0001 so the differences in readings are statistically significant (that is, the observation is highly unlikely to be the result of random chance alone). Refer Table 2.

Table 2 Comparison of IOP readings between GAT – Goldmann applanation Tonometer and NCT – Non contact Tonometer

Table 1 Distribution of observations (IOP GAT – Goldmann applanation Tonometer, IOP NCT – Non contact Tonometer, CCT – central corneal thickness)

![Figure 1 Bland and Altman Plot of IOP data obtained by GAT and NCT. Correlation R = 0.0136 (P=0.74). Slope = 0.0164 (P=0.74). Intercept = 1.894 (P<0.01)](image)

Discussion:
As per Cesk Slov et al the IOP measurements were much higher at NCT as compared to GAT. [9] According to Jorge J the NCT overestimated the IOP compared with GAT in normal, healthy eyes by about 1.7 mmHg on average (95% confidence) in the range of -2 to +6 mmHg). [10] We observed that IOP readings were on higher side as compared to GAT by 2.12 mmHg on average in 73% eyes (435 of 597). Only 13.5% observations (81 readings) produced lower IOP value as compared to GAT.

According to Kim N R et al IOP measurement differences in three tonometers (GAT, Tonopen and NCT) are affected by age, type of glaucoma, CCT, IOP levels. [11] We considered the effect of age, laterality of eye and CCT on the IOP measurement difference, but found no correlation.

Though NCT readings produce higher values compared to GAT, the readings are on higher side on lower GAT readings. The age, sex, laterality of eye, corneal thickness has no influence on the values. Refer Figure 2.
used for diagnostic purpose, but can be used as screening tool for community practices. It’s in line with study conducted by Mohan S - pulsair NCT can be used as screening tool for community practices but is not reliable in subjects with higher IOP range in Indian population. [12]

Conclusion:
The mean difference of IOP was statistically significant in NCT and GAT (mean difference 2.12, standard deviation difference 0.03, p < 0.0001). There are more chances to miss true positive cases by NCT. Hence NCT should be used for diagnostic purpose. However it can still be used as screening tool during mass or community screening.