



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*CORRESPONDENCE
W. Cooper Brookshire
✉ c.brookshire@msstate.edu

RECEIVED 14 July 2025
ACCEPTED 16 July 2025
PUBLISHED 08 August 2025

CITATION
Brookshire WC, Ballard LD, Langston VC,
Park JY and Seo K-S (2025) Correction:
Staphylococcal skin infection isolates from
dogs without recent antibiotic exposure are
100% susceptible to clindamycin.
Front. Vet. Sci. 12:1665861.
doi: 10.3389/fvets.2025.1665861

COPYRIGHT
© 2025 Brookshire, Ballard, Langston, Park
and Seo. This is an open-access article
distributed under the terms of the [Creative
Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#). The
use, distribution or reproduction in other
forums is permitted, provided the original
author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are
credited and that the original publication in
this journal is cited, in accordance with
accepted academic practice. No use,
distribution or reproduction is permitted
which does not comply with these terms.

Correction: Staphylococcal skin infection isolates from dogs without recent antibiotic exposure are 100% susceptible to clindamycin

W. Cooper Brookshire^{1*}, Larry D. Ballard²,
Vernon C. Langston ¹, Joo Youn Park ³ and Keun-Seok Seo³

¹Department of Clinical Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, United States, ²Department of Pathobiology and Population Medicine, College of Veterinary Medicine, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, United States, ³Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, United States

KEYWORDS

veterinary, antibiogram, *Staphylococcus pseudintermedius*, *S. schleiferi* antibiotic resistance, bacterial folliculitis, pyoderma, canine

A Correction on

Staphylococcal skin infection isolates from dogs without recent antibiotic exposure are 100% susceptible to clindamycin

by Brookshire, W. C., Ballard, L. D., Langston, V. C., Park, J. Y., and Seo, K. -S. (2025). *Front. Vet. Sci.* 11:1512582. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2024.1512582

In the published article, there was a mistake in the Funding statement. The funding statement for National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number U54GM115428 was excluded in error. The correct funding statement is “The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article. This study was funded by the Mississippi State University College of Veterinary Medicine Office of Research and Graduate Studies. This work was also supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number U54GM115428.”

The original article has been updated.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.