I understand that the manipulation in this experiment lends support for an SOA of up to 200ms (I think technically 400ms, if I recall that figure correctly) interrupting lexical processing and thus inhibiting PR, which is promising to have confirmed. But I have a few concerns about how implementing SOA would effect our experiment and the questions this research is able to address. The main potential issues off the top of my head are as follows

1. The talker with the initial onset (Talker A, if you will) always produced the critical shifted s/sh production, while the second talker (Talker B) only produced filler words/nonwords. Based on the 4th experiment, the significant factor for PR to occur is how much time the listener has to process the speech, which would be unconstrained in Talker B. We would have to depend on Talker A's speech fully masking Talker B's to not see PR to both talkers, which I imagine would be less effective if there were an SOA > 0.
2. I would argue that because the goal of the Samuel 2016 paper is to identify the start and duration of the lexical processing window (what allows for PR to take place), using a paradigm that uses a SOA makes sense because ethe purpose is to interrupt that window battle ship-style. I'm not sure if exploring how directing attention effects PR is necessarily the same as how redirecting attention effects PR, which is essentially what simulating an interruption using Talker B --and also environmental sounds in Exp. 3-- is doing. Because we are aware of the effects of implementing an SOA > 0 and there is no other reason we would have for adding this factor to our paradigm except for the information provided in this study, I would be uncomfortable with attempting to generalize conclusions about the role of redirecting attention in PR (i.e., purposefully interrupting a processing window, which there is strong evidence that is why we see these effects in the Samuel 2016 paper) to the overall role of attention, if that makes sense.
3. In terms of the goals of this experiment and the overarching questions I am interested in, I would like to look at factors that cause listeners to process one type of speech over another. In the Samuel 2016 experiments, it is impossible to reliably confirm that the effects of redirecting attention stem from only having the listener's complete a task that requires their attention to be directed at Talker B. Is there possibly a temporal bias due to the order in which the stimuli are heard, in addition to prioritization due to the task at hand? Theoretically, it would make sense that in the absence of a task that would direct listeners attention to one of the two talkers, listeners may favor listening to the speech they hear most recently, or vice versa! These are important factors to consider when using this paradigm in the future, which was the initial motive behind designing this first experiment.

The focus of the Samuel 2016 paper is to explore the dependency of PR on lexical processing; specifically, how long attention must be directed at speech for PR to take place. To achieve this, Dr. Samuel developed a paradigm where participants were instructed to attend to one of two simulated talkers in a set of 5 experiments. The 1st talker produced speech with a phonetically shifted s/sh and was always presented before the 2nd talker. The 2nd talker only produced filler words or filler nonwords. The amount of time between the onset of the 1st talker and the onset of the 2nd talker was varied between each experiment. Participants were instructed to attend to the 2nd talker to complete a series of tasks. PR to the 1st talker was used to measure the effects of redirecting the participant's attention at different points in the 1st talker's speech. Samuels found that when the onset of the 2nd talker was presented <200ms after the 1st talker, the participant did not exhibit PR. When this value was increased, participants did exhibit PR. This suggests that listeners need at least 200ms to process the stimulus to recalibrate their perception of an s/sh speech sound. Furthermore, if participants were instructed to complete a task that directed their attention to the 1st talker instead, they were found to exhibit PR.