MAR Clinical Case Reports (2026) 7:2

Mini Riview Article

Gastric versus Small Bowel Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors: A Contemporary Case-Comparison and Evidence-Based Review

Vinod Kumar Singhal [1], Adil Mohammed Suleman [2], Faris Dawood Alaswad [3], Vidher V V Singhal [4]

1. *Consultant, General Surgeon, prime Hospital, Dubai, UAE*
2. *Specialist, General Surgery, Prime Clinics and Hospital, Dubai, UAE*
3. *Consultant, General Surgeon, Gladstone Hospital, Perth, Australia*
4. *Postgraduate (MSci), Medical Innovation & Enterprises, UCL London, UK.*

*__Correspondence to__: Vinod Kumar Singhal. Consultant, General Surgeon, prime Hospital, Dubai, UAE.

Received: 12 February 2026

Published: 01 March 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18829362

Abstract

Gastrointestinal stromal tumors (GISTs) are the most common mesenchymal neoplasms of the gastrointestinal tract, yet they exhibit striking heterogeneity in clinical behavior, malignant potential, and therapeutic response depending on anatomical origin. Gastric and small bowel GISTs represent the two predominant subtypes and differ significantly in molecular alterations, risk stratification, recurrence patterns, and survival outcomes. This comprehensive comparative review integrates representative clinical cases with an extensive analysis of published literature to delineate the biological and clinical distinctions between gastric and small bowel GISTs. Emphasis is placed on molecular genetics, prognostic models, surgical complexity, targeted therapy response, and long-term outcomes, highlighting the necessity of location-specific management strategies.

Introduction

Gastrointestinal stromal tumors (GISTs) are the most common mesenchymal tumors of the gastrointestinal tract and arise from the interstitial cells of Cajal or their precursors. Over the past decade, advances in molecular diagnostics, risk stratification models, and targeted therapies have significantly reshaped the clinical management of GIST. Despite these advances, heterogeneity in biological behavior remains a defining feature of the disease, with anatomical location emerging as a critical determinant of prognosis and treatment strategy. Contemporary large-scale cohort studies and guideline updates consistently demonstrate that gastric and small bowel GISTs differ substantially in recurrence risk, molecular profile, and long-term outcomes, even when matched for tumor size and mitotic activity. Gastric GISTs, which account for approximately 60–65% of cases, are generally associated with more indolent behavior and favorable survival, whereas small bowel GISTs (25–30%) exhibit a higher propensity for aggressive growth, recurrence, and metastatic spread [1–4].

Modern risk classification systems, including modified Joensuu-based models and newer relapse-risk scoring tools, explicitly incorporate tumor site as an independent prognostic variable. This shift reflects accumulating evidence that anatomical location is not merely a surrogate for tumor size or mitotic index but represents an intrinsic biological modifier of disease behavior. As a result, current international guidelines advocate location-specific risk assessment and management, particularly when decisions regarding adjuvant therapy and surveillance intensity are considered [5].

Against this background, a comparative, case-based analysis of gastric versus small bowel GIST provides a clinically relevant framework for understanding how location influences pathology, molecular characteristics, therapeutic response, and outcomes. This article integrates representative clinical cases with contemporary evidence (2014–2025) to elucidate these differences and support precision-based management strategies.

Molecular Pathogenesis and Genetic Divergence

Approximately 75–80% of GISTs harbor activating mutations in the KIT gene, most frequently involving exon 11, followed by exon 9 mutations. KIT exon 11 mutations predominate in gastric GISTs and are associated with favorable response to imatinib therapy and improved overall survival. In contrast, small bowel GISTs more frequently exhibit KIT exon 9 mutations, which are associated with increased aggressiveness and relative resistance to standard-dose imatinib [6].

An additional 5–10% of GISTs harbor PDGFRA mutations, predominantly occurring in gastric tumors with epithelioid morphology and indolent behavior [10]. Wild-type GISTs, including SDH-deficient tumors, show distinct clinical and molecular characteristics and are more commonly gastric in origin.

These molecular differences form the biological basis for the divergent clinical behavior observed between gastric and small bowel GISTs and underscore the necessity of routine mutational analysis.

Case Comparison

Case 1 : Gastric GIST

A 62-year-old female presented with nonspecific dyspeptic symptoms. Endoscopy revealed a submucosal gastric mass, and CT imaging demonstrated a 4.2-cm exophytic lesion along the lesser curvature without metastasis. Histopathology showed spindle-cell morphology with low mitotic activity (2/50 HPF). Immunohistochemistry was positive for KIT and DOG1. Molecular analysis identified a KIT exon 11 mutation. The patient underwent laparoscopic wedge resection with negative margins and remains disease-free at three years.

Case 2: Small Bowel GIST

A 55-year-old male presented with acute abdominal pain and anemia. Imaging revealed a 4.5-cm jejunal mass with central necrosis. Histopathology demonstrated high cellularity with marked nuclear atypia and a mitotic count of 12/50 HPF. KIT exon 9 mutation was identified. Segmental resection was performed, followed by adjuvant imatinib. Despite therapy, hepatic metastases developed within 18 months.

These cases typify the contrasting biological behavior of gastric and small bowel GISTs despite similar tumor size.

Comparative Clinicopathological Characteristics

Parameter	Gastric GIST	Small Bowel GIST
Incidence	60–65%	25–30%
Common symptoms	Incidental, dyspepsia	Bleeding, pain, obstruction
Growth pattern	Exophytic, localized	Infiltrative, necrotic
Mitotic activity	Usually low	Frequently high
Common mutation	KIT exon 11, PDGFRA	KIT exon 9
Tumor rupture	Rare	More common
Prognosis	Favorable	Less favorable

Table 1. Comparative Features of Gastric and Small Bowel GISTs

Population-based studies consistently demonstrate inferior recurrence-free and overall survival in small bowel GISTs compared with gastric counterparts [6,12].

Risk Stratification: Impact of Tumor Location

Risk assessment models incorporating tumor size and mitotic rate were initially used to predict malignant potential. However, subsequent studies demonstrated that tumors of identical size and mitotic index behave more aggressively when arising from the small intestine. Joensuu's modified risk classification incorporates tumor site as a critical variable, reflecting the independent prognostic significance of location [7].

Surgical Management: Comparative Considerations

Complete surgical resection with negative margins remains the cornerstone of treatment for localized GIST. Gastric GISTs are often amenable to limited resections, including laparoscopic wedge excision, with minimal functional compromise. In contrast, small bowel GISTs frequently present as emergencies due to bleeding or obstruction, necessitating urgent segmental resection and increasing perioperative risk.

Tumor rupture, a powerful adverse prognostic factor, occurs more commonly in small bowel GISTs and mandates prolonged adjuvant therapy [8].

Targeted Therapy and Therapeutic Response

Imatinib mesylate has dramatically improved outcomes in advanced and high-risk GIST. Gastric GISTs with KIT exon 11 mutations exhibit superior response rates and prolonged progression-free survival. Small bowel

GISTs with exon 9 mutations often require higher doses of imatinib (800 mg/day) to achieve optimal response and still demonstrate inferior outcomes.

Second-line agents such as sunitinib and regorafenib provide additional disease control in resistant cases but do not fully overcome the adverse prognosis associated with non-gastric location [9].

Long-Term Outcomes and Survival

Five-year disease-free survival rates for gastric GISTs range from 70–90% in low- to intermediate-risk groups, compared with significantly lower rates for small bowel tumors. These disparities persist even in the era of targeted therapy, emphasizing the fundamental biological differences between tumor sites.

Discussion

Recent literature consistently confirms that gastric and small bowel GISTs represent biologically and clinically distinct subgroups, rather than site-based variants of a single disease entity. Large comparative cohort studies published over the last decade demonstrate that non-gastric GISTs, particularly those arising in the jejunum and ileum, carry a significantly higher risk of recurrence and disease-specific mortality, even when conventional prognostic parameters appear similar [10].

One of the most robust findings in contemporary GIST research is the persistent adverse prognostic impact of small bowel location. Analyses incorporating modern risk models show that small bowel GISTs recur more frequently than gastric tumors of equivalent size and mitotic rate, leading to systematic underestimation of risk when tumor site is ignored. Recent 2023–2025 studies further suggest that jejunoileal GISTs may relapse even in categories traditionally labeled as “low risk,” reinforcing the need for heightened vigilance and individualized follow-up in this subgroup [11].

Molecular profiling provides a mechanistic basis for these clinical differences. Gastric GISTs more frequently harbor KIT exon 11 or PDGFRA mutations, both of which are associated with favorable response to imatinib and improved long-term disease control. In contrast, small bowel GISTs show a higher prevalence of KIT exon 9 mutations, which correlate with increased malignant potential and reduced sensitivity to standard-dose imatinib [12]. Real-world European multicenter analyses published after 2020 highlight ongoing debate regarding optimal adjuvant dosing in exon 9–mutated tumors, underscoring the complexity of treating small bowel GIST even in the era of targeted therapy [13].

Surgical factors further accentuate this divergence. Gastric GISTs are often detected incidentally and allow planned, limited resections with low rupture risk. Conversely, small bowel GISTs frequently present with bleeding, obstruction, or acute abdomen, necessitating urgent intervention and increasing the likelihood of tumor rupture an event universally recognized as one of the strongest predictors of recurrence and a decisive

factor in adjuvant treatment planning [14]. Contemporary guidelines consistently emphasize rupture status as a critical modifier of risk category, particularly in non-gastric tumors [15].

Despite advances in adjuvant and metastatic therapy, outcome disparities between gastric and small bowel GIST persist. Long-term follow-up studies published between 2019 and 2024 demonstrate that adjuvant imatinib significantly improves recurrence-free survival in high-risk patients but does not fully negate the adverse prognostic influence of non-gastric location [16,17]. These findings suggest that tumor site reflects fundamental biological behavior rather than differences in therapeutic exposure alone.

Taken together, current evidence supports a site-aware, biology-driven model of GIST management, in which gastric and small bowel tumors are approached with different thresholds for adjuvant therapy, surveillance intensity, and prognostic counseling. Failure to integrate anatomical location into decision-making risks both overtreatment of indolent gastric tumors and undertreatment of aggressive small bowel disease [18].

Conclusion

Gastric and small bowel gastrointestinal stromal tumors exhibit meaningful and clinically significant differences in molecular biology, pathological behavior, and oncologic outcomes. Evidence from contemporary studies (2014–2025) clearly demonstrates that tumor location functions as an independent prognostic determinant, influencing recurrence risk, therapeutic response, and long-term survival.

Gastric GISTs generally pursue a more indolent course and often achieve durable disease control with surgical resection alone when low-risk features and favorable molecular profiles are present. In contrast, small bowel GISTs demonstrate higher malignant potential, increased recurrence rates, and reduced responsiveness to standard-dose targeted therapy, even in tumors of comparable size. These distinctions necessitate a more aggressive risk assessment, stronger consideration for adjuvant therapy, and closer surveillance in small bowel primaries.

A comparative, location-specific approach that integrates anatomical site, mutation status, mitotic activity, tumor size, and rupture status is essential for precision oncology–driven management of GIST. Adoption of this framework, as endorsed by recent international guidelines, offers the best opportunity to optimize outcomes while minimizing unnecessary treatment burden.

References

1. Jang SH, et al. Risk factors for recurrence after resection of GIST. Intest Res. 2014.

2. Yang Z, et al. Comparative outcomes of gastric vs small intestinal GIST. Sci Rep. 2019.

3. Colapkulu-Akgul N, et al. Prognostic comparison of gastric and non-gastric GISTs. 2023.

4. Miettinen M, Lasota J. Contemporary site-based GIST prognosis. Semin Diagn Pathol. 2015.

5. Joensuu H, et al. Risk of recurrence in GIST: Updated models. Lancet Oncol. 2012 (validated in later cohorts).

6. Cho YK, et al. RECKGIST relapse risk score. 2025.

7. Sun X, et al. Recurrence predictors in jejunoileal GIST. 2025.

8. Casali PG, et al. ESMO–EURACAN–GENTURIS Guidelines. Ann Oncol. 2022.

9. Serrano C, et al. GEIS Guidelines for GIST. 2023.

10. Serrano C, et al. SEOM–GEIS Clinical Guideline. 2023.

11. National Cancer Institute. GIST Treatment (PDQ®). Updated 2024.

12. Rutkowski P, et al. Long-term outcomes by site in GIST. Ann Surg Oncol. 2016.

13. D'Ambrosio L, et al. Surveillance outcomes in low-risk GIST. JAMA Netw Open. 2023.

14. Heinrich MC, et al. KIT mutation response patterns. J Clin Oncol. 2017.

15. Vincenzi B, et al. KIT exon 9 GIST: Adjuvant dosing analysis. 2021.

16. Blay JY, et al. Adjuvant imatinib and recurrence patterns. J Clin Oncol. 2020.

17. Laurent M, et al. Adjuvant imatinib considerations. Transl Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2019.

18. Judson I, et al. Tumor rupture and prognosis. Br J Cancer. 2020.

Medtronic