# **Goldmann Applanation Tonometer Vs Schiotz Tonometer** in Measuring Intraocular Pressure

Dr. BOVILLA MOUNIKA<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. P SANJEEVA KUMAR<sup>2</sup>,

Dr. NALLAMARI SOWMYA<sup>3</sup>

(Postgraduate<sup>\*1</sup>, Professor<sup>2</sup>, Postgraduate<sup>3</sup> Dept of Ophthalmology Santhiram Medical College, Nandyal, Andhra Pradesh, India)

## Abstract:

Background: Glaucoma is a common cause of permanent vision loss worldwide, ranking second after cataracts. Around 40 million people aged 40 and older either have glaucoma or are at risk of developing it. Assessing the performance and reliability of various tonometers in diverse settings is crucial for optimizing glaucoma detection and management, especially in resource-limited environments. **Objective:** 

1. To compare the effiacy of Shiotz and goldmann applanation tonometer

Materials and Methods: 50 patients were included. This cross sectionall study was done in the Department of Opthalmoology at Santhiram Medical College, Nandval, Andhra Pradesh, India. Male and females aged above 40 years with newly diagnosed glaucome were included.

**Results:** Most of the patients belonged to the age group 51 to 60 years(50%), followed by 41 to 50 years(28%). 70% of the patients were females. Mean IOP was 24.7mm as measured by Goldmanns tonometer and it was 23.9 mm as measured by Schiotz. The sensitivity of Goldmann tonometer in detecting glaucoma was 86.49%, specificity was 57.14%, and diagnostic accuracy was 80%. The sensitivity of schiotz tonometer in detecting glaucoma was 88.89%, specificity was 71.47%, and diagnostic accuracy was 88%.

**Conclusion:** Schiotz tonometry produced comparable results with Goldmann applanation tonometry, showing good specificity and reliability in detecting positives, serving as a viable screening tool.

Keywords: Glaucoma, Intraocular pressure, Schitoz tonometer, Goldmann tonometer, Vision loss

Date of Submission: 27-06-2024

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Acceptance: 05-07-2024 \_\_\_\_\_

## I. INTRODUCTION

Glaucoma is a common cause of permanent vision loss worldwide, ranking second after cataracts.<sup>1</sup> Around 40 million people aged 40 and older either have glaucoma or are at risk of developing it.<sup>2</sup> Intraocular pressure (IOP) is a main risk factor which can be modified in glaucoma. Clinical trials have shown that even a slight increase in IOP can lead to damage to the visual field and progression of the disease. Therefore, precise measurement of IOP is important for predicting and monitoring disease progression. 3-4

Ophthalmologists rely on accurate techniques to detect glaucoma early.

Glaucoma ranks as 2<sup>nd</sup> most common cause of irreversible vision loss worldwide, with prevalence in South India ranging from 1.62% to 2.6%<sup>5-6</sup> It is characterized by chronic optic neuropathy involving structural and functional changes in optic nerve head, where elevated intraocular pressure (IOP) is a significant risk factor. Normal IOP is crucial for maintaining ocular shape and visual function, as prolonged elevation can lead to irreversible damage to retinal ganglion cells and nerve fibers.7 Accurate measurement of IOP not only guides treatment initiation but also monitors treatment effectiveness.8

Advancements in tonometry instrumentation over recent decades aim to enhance the accuracy of IOP measurement, yet ocular and non-ocular factors can complicate measurements and treatment.<sup>9</sup> In India, public health institutions, particularly those serving underprivileged communities, rely heavily on rural camps for population-wide screening of vision disorders. In these settings, cost-effectiveness of tonometers play a crucial role in device selection. Often, due to limited manpower, optometrists perform rapid IOP measurements, raising questions about the accuracy of cheaper, user-friendly tonometers.

Assessing the performance and reliability of various tonometers in diverse settings is crucial for optimizing glaucoma detection and management, especially in resource-limited environments.

## **Objective:**

To compare the effiacy of Shiotz and goldmann applanation tonometer

## **II. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

STUDY DESIGN: Comparative study

Source of study population: Patients with Glaucoma attending ophthalmology unit at Santhiram Medical College, Nandval, Andhra Pradesh

**STUDY PERIOD**: 12 months

#### SAMPLE SIZE: 50

Ethical approval: Informed consent was taken from every participant.

### **INCLUSION CRITERIA:**

1. Patients aged above 40 years

2. Both genders

3. Newly diagnosed glaucoma patients

#### EXCLUSION CRITERIA

1. Patients taking treatment for glaucoma

Patients with scarred or hazy cornea

Patients who underwent corneal surgeries like refractive surgery, Blepharospary, micropthalmos, Nystagmus, Keratoconus

Patients having corneal infections.

#### Methodology:

Ocular examination began with assessing visual acuity using Snellen charts for literate patients and C charts for illiterate patients, both with and without pinhole correction. Refractive error was determined using retinoscopy and auto-refractometry. The examination covered the conjunctiva, sclera, cornea, iris, pupil, anterior chamber, lens, posterior chamber, and posterior segment of each patient's eye.

Each participant received two types of tonometry: Goldmann Applanation tonometry and Schiotz Indentation tonometry. Topical anesthesia was given using 0.5% proparacaine eye drops before the tonometry procedure. Goldmann Applanation tonometry readings were taken first, followed by Schiotz Indentation tonometry. Three consecutive readings were obtained for each eye using each method, and the average of these readings was recorded as the intraocular pressure (IOP).

Statistical analysis: Analysis was done using Microsoft software. Mean, SD, percentages, and frequencies were used.

## III. RESULTS

#### Age and gender:

Most of the patients belonged to the age group 51 to 60 years(50%), followed by 41 to 50 years(28%). 70% of the patients were females.

| AGE            | No. of Patients | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| 41 TO 50       | 14              | 28%        |
| 51 TO 60       | 25              | 50%        |
| ABOVE 60 YEARS | 11              | 22%        |
| Total          | 50              | 100%       |

Mean age was 53 years.

**IOP mean:** Mean IOP was 24.7mm as measured by Goldmanns tonometer and it was 23.9 mm as measured by Schiotz.

Table 1: Age distribution of patients

| PARAMETERS | GOLDMANN | SCHIOTZ              |
|------------|----------|----------------------|
| MEAN IOP   | 24.7±2.6 | 23.9±1.4 MM OF<br>HG |

 Table 2: Mean IOP measured by both methods

#### Sensitivity, specificity, diagnostic accuracy of Goldmann tonometer:

There were 8 true negative cases, 5 false negative cases, 5 false positive cases and 32 true positive cases. The sensitivity of Goldmann tonometer in detecting glaucoma was 86.49%, specificity was 57.14%, and diagnostic accuracy was 80%.

| Statistic                     | Value  | 95% CI           |
|-------------------------------|--------|------------------|
| Sensitivity                   | 88.89% | 73.94% to 96.89% |
| Specificity                   | 57.14% | 28.86% to 82.34% |
| Positive Likelihood Ratio     | 2.07   | 1.12 to 3.84     |
| Negative Likelihood Ratio     | 0.19   | 0.07 to 0.54     |
| Disease prevalence (*)        | 72.00% | 57.51% to 83.77% |
| Positive Predictive Value (*) | 84.21% | 74.23% to 90.80% |
| Negative Predictive Value (*) | 66.67% | 41.67% to 84.84% |
| Accuracy (*)                  | 80.00% | 66.28% to 89.97% |

Goldmann Applanation Tonometer Vs Schiotz Tonometer in Measuring Intraocular Pressure

Table 3: Accuracy of Goldmann tonometer



Graph 1: Accuracy of Goldmann tonometer

## Sensitivity, specificity, diagnostic accuracy of Shiotz tonometer:

There were 10 true negative cases, 4 false negative cases, 4 false positive cases ans 32 true positive cases. The sensitivity of schiotz tonometer in detecting glaucoma was 88.89%, specificity was 71.47%, and diagnostic accuracy was 88%.

| Statistic                     | Value  | 95% CI           |
|-------------------------------|--------|------------------|
| Sensitivity                   | 88.89% | 73.94% to 96.89% |
| Specificity                   | 71.43% | 41.90% to 91.61% |
| Positive Likelihood Ratio     | 3.11   | 1.35 to 7.18     |
| Negative Likelihood Ratio     | 0.16   | 0.06 to 0.42     |
| Disease prevalence (*)        | 72.00% | 57.51% to 83.77% |
| Positive Predictive Value (*) | 88.89% | 77.61% to 94.86% |
| Negative Predictive Value (*) | 71.43% | 48.37% to 86.96% |

Accuracy (\*)

84.00% 70.89% to 92.83%

Table 4: Accuracy of Schiotz tonometer



Graph 2: Accuracy of Schiotz tonometer

## **IV. DISCUSSION**

Glaucoma is a multifactorial disease that causes optic nerve damage, which is characterized by specific structural changes in optic disc and functional deficits in visual field testing.<sup>10</sup>

Increased IOP can cause irreversible damage to ganglion cells and nerve fibers, emphasizing the importance of accurate IOP detection for initiating and monitoring treatment.

This comparative study was done on intraocular pressure measurement using Goldmann applanation tonometry (GAT) versus Schiotz tonometry (ST) as a screening tool in South indian population, 50 patients were examined. Most of the patients belonged to the age group 51 to 60 years(50%), followed by 41 to 50 years(28%). 70% of the patients were females. Mean IOP was 24.7mm as measured by Goldmanns tonometer and it was 23.9 mm as measured by Schiotz. The sensitivity of Goldmann tonometer in detecting glaucoma was 86.49%, specificity was 57.14%, and diagnostic accuracy was 80%. The sensitivity of schiotz tonometer in detecting glaucoma was 88.89%, specificity was 71.47%, and diagnostic accuracy was 88%. In the study of **Munaff et al.**<sup>12</sup> "ho published a study in 2024.

Most of the patients were aged between 40-50 years, followed by 51-60 years, 61-70 years, and Goldmann findings showed specificity of 52% and sensitivity of 95.3%, and ST showed specificity of 54% and sensitivity of 97.2%. PPV was 80.1% for GAT and 82.3% for ST, and NPV was 89.2% for GAT and 90.8% for ST. These results are consistent with studies done by **Foster, Ouyang, Allinghan et al.**<sup>13-15</sup>

In spite of being gold standard, GAT shows intra- and inter-reader variability and may not be suitable in few clinical settings, like operating rooms or primary care by general practitioners. <sup>16</sup>

ST, though providing a range rather than a precise measurement, tends to read lower than GAT by about 1.2 mm Hg, mentioning the role in detecting abnormal IOP .<sup>17-18</sup>

Limitations:

Relatively mall sample size

Lack of access to the latest technologies

Correlation between Goldmann and Schitoz findings were not done.

There are no conflicts of interest to declare, and the study was self-funded.

# V. CONCLUSION

Schiotz tonometry produced comparable results with Goldmann applanation tonometry, showing good specificity and reliability in detecting positives, serving as a viable screening tool. It could be especially useful in primary health centers for monitoring IOP in established glaucoma cases, with GAT reserved for confirmation and follow-up in cases of abnormal findings.

The study is self-sponsored.

There were no conflicts of interest.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Resnikaff S, Pascolini D. Global data on visual impairment in the year 2002. Bull World Health Organ. 2004;82(11):844-5.
- [2]. George R, Ramesh SV. Glaucoma in India: estimated burden of disease. J Glaucoma. 2010;19(6):391-7.
   [3]. Sharma H, Nainiwal SK. Intraocular pressure measurement techniques: current concepts and review. Ind
- [3]. Sharma H, Nainiwal SK. Intraocular pressure measurement techniques: current concepts and review. Indian J Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2020;6(3):315-23.
- [4]. Kniestedt C, Lin S. Tonometer through the ages. J Ophthalmic Surg. 2008;53:568-91.
- [5]. Stevens GA, White RA, Flaxman SR, Price H, Jonas JB, Keeffe J, et al. Global prevalence of vision impairment and blindness: magnitude and temporal trends, 1990–2010. Ophthalmology. 2013;120(12):2377-2384.
- [6]. Vijaya L, George R, Paul PG, Baskaran M, Arvind H, Raju P, et al. Prevalence of open-angle glaucoma in a rural south Indian population. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2005;46(12):4461-4467.
- [7]. Quyang PB, Li CY, Zhu XH, Duan XC. Assessment of intraocular pressure measured by Reichert ocular response analyzer, Goldmann applanation tonometry, and dynamic contour tonometry in healthy individuals. Int J Ophthalmol. 2012;5:102-107.
- [8]. Medeiros FA, Alencar LM, Sample PA, Zangwill LM, Susanna R Jr., Weinreb RN. The relationship between intraocular pressure reduction and rates of progressive visual field loss in eyes with optic disc hemorrhage. Ophthalmology. 2010;117(10):2061-2066.
- [9]. Chui WS, Lam A, Chen D, Chiu R. The influence of corneal properties on rebound tonometry. Ophthalmology. 2008;115(1):80-84.
   [10]. Andreson DR. Grant WM. Re-evaluation of the Schiotz tonometer calibration. Invest Ophthalmol. 1970;9:430-46.
- [11]. David RCC, Moghimi S, Do JL, Hou H, Proudfoot J, Zangwill LM, Kamalipour A, Nishida T, De Moraes CG, Girkin CA, Liebmann JM, Weinreb RN. Characteristics of Central Visual Field Progression in Eyes with Optic Disc Hemorrhage. Am J Ophthalmol. 2021 Nov:231:109-119. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2021.05.026. Epub 2021 Jun 6. PMID: 34107310; PMCID: PMC9422436.
- [12]. Munaff US, Kulkarni P. A Comparative Study of Intraocular Pressure Measurements by Goldmann Applanation Tonometer and Schiotztonometer and the Study of Schiotz Tonometer a Screening Tool in North Karnataka Population. Indian J Public Health Res Dev. 2024 Jan-Mar;15(1):381.
- [13]. Foster PJ. The definition and classification of glaucoma in prevalence survey. Br J Ophthalmol. 2002;86(2):238-242.
- [14]. Ouyang PB, Li CY. Assessment of intraocular pressure measured by Reichert ocular analyser Goldmann applanation tonometer and dynamic contour tonometry in healthy individuals. Int J Ophthalmol. 2012;5(1):102-4.
- [15]. Allingham R, Randal PH. Shields Textbook of Glaucoma. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2005. p. 392-96.
- [16]. Jockson CRS. Schiotztonometers: an assessment of their usefulness. Br J Ophthalmol. 1965;49:478-80.
- [17]. Lassek J. Comparison of tonometers using three different non-invasive tonometers in children. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2008;246:1463-6.
- [18]. Chiara GF. Portable tonometers; a clinical comparison of applanation and indentation devices. J Am Ophthalmol Assoc. 1989;60(2):105-10.