A primary article is written from first hand knowledge of a scientific process. The scientific process is by itself and doesn't follow in support of another experiment. The text includes sections of Introduction, Methods, Discussion, and References. The articles go through the peer review process.

A review article is not a new finding or scientific experiment. Its purpose is to support a previous finding. In the text you will find a summary of the primary article it is supporting or referring to. All of the research in a study will not be found in a review article.

The scientific peer review process is written with other researchers in mind. The first step is to go to experts for the peer review process of the research to find authenticity. The reviewers report back to the editor if they can determine questions, if it relates and if the information is true, how important is it? Most articles don't make it through the process. The experts usually recommend having revisions, but not always. It can take months to years to go through this whole process.

The article titled "ORIGINAL ARTICLE Permanent inactivation of Huntington's disease mutation by personalized allele-specific CRISPR/Cas9" is a primary article, it follows the sections of Introduction Methods, Discussion, and References. The big thing that led me to believe this is the primary article is that it actually explains the experiment. The supporting article is the "Huntington's Disease: Mechanisms of Pathogenesis and Therapeutic Strategies" this article references a lot of different articles and does not come up with new findings. The primary article had an abstract also tells me that it is a primary article.