

Ryan Belcher

9/10/2022

Professor Rinehart-Kim

Genetics (Asynchronous) RN 19310

In regards to scientific works, there tends to be two main variants of writings: primary and secondary articles. Whether a work is primary or secondary pertains to whom the article is written by, for example, a work that is original to the specific finding or case is deemed as a primary sourced article as the individuals who were working on the study wrote the findings. The parts of a primary article include the introduction, which explains the purpose of the experimentation/study, the methods, which describes the process or proceedings that were done to complete the experiment/study, the results, which give the conclusion or data of what was found, the discussion, which talks about what and why things were done the way they were during an experimentation and what may be changed or improved upon, and finally the references, which discusses information found by other individuals to compare or support the data found in the experiment/study.

A secondary article pertains to information from experiments that have been concluded from another's original research. These are often found in books, magazines, and secondary scientific journals. These typically lay a ground work for review articles which provides information on a particular subject but makes it more comprehensible for those who are not familiar with the subject to understand.

In regards to these works, original content usually undergoes a peer review process of which another individual in the scientific community, usually one familiar with what is being

researched, reads the information found and revises original documents to be more interpretive and able to be applied as information for other studies.

Apropos to the two articles versions of “Permanent inactivation of Huntington's disease mutation by personalized allele-specific CRISPR/Cas9” that have been provided. The version of the article located on the *National Library of Medicine* appears to be the original document compared to the .pdf file. The document provided directly on the website uses the date of 2016 for submission and consistently uses the term ‘we’ in the sentences, suggesting first-person as though the writers are those who completed the experimentation. The .pdf file appears to lack many of the terms of that of first person, suggesting that the author/editor was not there at the time of the experimentation and the date of the experiment appears to be 2017, suggesting that the information was submitted in 2017 rather than that of the original document’s 2016.