We thank the reviewers for their careful reading of our manuscript and their many insightful comments and suggestions towards improving our paper. Below we provide a single response to all the comments of the reviewers, which will be added to the paper.

Motivation: The main motivation of this work is to propose **the first XNOR-LSTM model** where all the recurrent multiplications in both the gate and the state computations are performed using XNOR operations. Note that the existing quantization methods (i.e.,

[18-19] and [26]) only focused on quantization of the gate computations while retaining the state computations in full-precision (FP).

Originality: To obtain an XNOR-LSTM model, we use stochastic computing in a substantially different way from the standard stochastic computing (SC). Let us consider the vector-matrix multiplication of the gate computation as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} & h_{12} & \dots & h_{1d_h} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ w_{d_h} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_{11} & w_{12} & \dots & w_{1d_h} \\ w_{22} & \dots & w_{2d_h} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ w_{d_h} \end{bmatrix} M = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} \odot w_{11} \\ h_{12} \odot w_{21} \\ h_{d_1} \odot w_{d_1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} \odot w_{12} & \dots & h_{11} \odot w_{1d_h} \\ h_{12} \odot w_{22} & \dots & h_{12} \odot w_{2d_h} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ h_{d_h} \odot w_{d_h} \end{bmatrix}$$

In non-stochastic computing method, we simply perform the element-wise multiplication between the vector h and each column of the matrix W to obtain the matrix M. Then, the accumulation over each column of the matrix M gives us the result of the vector-matrix multiplication. This process is performed using a multiply-accumulate (MAC) unit on CPUs, GPUs and specialized hardware. Having d_h parallel MAC units, the vector-matrix multiplication takes d_h clock cycles where d_h denotes the number of rows and columns of the square weight matrix W. In the standard SC, a binary stochastic stream of size l is generated for each element of both the vector \mathbf{h} and the matrix \mathbf{W} , introducing an additional dimension of size l to them and an overhead latency of lclock cycles. For example, the standard stochastic version of the vector \mathbf{h} is a matrix of size $d_h \times l$. Therefore, even though the standard SC allows to perform the vector-matrix multiplication using XNOR operations, it suffers from the long computation time overhead (see [20] and [28]). In our work, however, we took substantially a different approach. The main idea was started with this question: Can we treat the row of **h**, each column of **W** and consequently each column of **M** as stochastic streams of length $l=d_h$ if all the elements were binary? In this way, we do not generate any stochastic stream and we only treat each column of the M as a stochastic stream. Compared to the non-stochastic computation, we only perform the element-wise multiplication without any accumulation over the columns of M, allowing us to perform the state computations using stochastic logic units (i.e., in binary). Note that since there is always a scaling factor α in the binarization process and bias, we tweak our representation from binary SC to integral SC. We then proposed an integral SC tanh function that takes each column of the matrix M and returns a binary stochastic stream of the same length, approximating the non-linear functions used in LSTMs. Now, we have the gate values (i.e., f, i, o and g) represented as binary stochastic stream, allowing us to replace the multiplications in Eq. (2) with XNOR operations. When the state computations are done, we perform accumulation over the stochastic streams to obtain real values of the next state vector h. In fact, compared to the conventional binarized LSTM models (e.g., [26]) as shown in Figure (a) and (b), the accumulator unit in the gate computations of the conventional method is shifted to the end of state computations in our stochastic computing method (see Figure (c) and (d)). Note that the **length of all stochastic streams** (i.e., the parameter l) in our proposed method is equal to the size of LSTMs which is a design parameter and denoted as d_h in the paper. To binarize the weight matrix W and the hidden state vector h, we leveraged the non-SC techniques introduced in [17] and [20] as described in Section 4.1. Note that sampling from the Bernoulli distribution in Section 4.1 only happens during the training phase to obtain binarized weights. Once the training is finished, deterministic binary values are stored for inference and we treat these deterministic binary values as stochastic streams in our work. Therefore, both weights and hidden state values are stored as deterministic binary values, reducing the memory footprint by a factor of 32× compared to FP. Moreover, the number of I/O and memory elements are the same as of conventional quantization methods since we only viewed the binarized weights and hidden states as stochastic streams.

Implementation Cost: In the comparison section, we only compared the cost of our method in terms of XNOR operations since our main focus was to replace the costly multipliers with simple XNOR gates while the rest of computing elements (i.e., the adders and look-up tables) almost remains the same (see Figure (a,b,c,d)). Note that since SNG and ISNG can be easily implemented with magnetic tunnel junction (MTJ) devices which come almost at no cost compared to CMOS technologies, we excluded them from the implementation cost. However, based on the reviewers' comment, we have implemented both non-stochastic binarized method (e.g., [26]) and our proposed method on a Xilinx Virtex-7 FPGA device where each architecture contains 300 neurons. The implementation of our proposed method requires 66K FPGA slices while yielding the throughput of 3.2 TOPS @ 934 MHz whereas the implementation of the non-stochastic binarized method requires 1.1M FPGA slices while yielding the throughput of 1.8 TOPS @ 515 MHz. Therefore, our proposed method outperforms its binarized counterpart by factors of 16.7× and 1.8× in terms of area and throughput, respectively, while considering all the required logic such as SNG, ISNG and look-up tables. Note that the number of occupied slices denotes the area size of the implemented design. Also, the proposed implementation runs at a higher frequency since its critical path is shorter than the conventional method due to the simpler hardware of XNOR gates vs multipliers.

WikiText-2: Based on the reviewer's comment, we have performed our method on WikiText-2 dataset which contains 33K vocabulary and is $3 \times$ larger than PTB. We obtained PPW values of 105.5, 107.3 and 109.4 for FP baseline, our ELSTM model and our XNOR model on a hidden size of 512 (i.e., $d_h = 512$), respectively. The obtained results are consistent with the results obtained for PTB. **Figure 3**: To obtain the results in Figure 3, we measured the output of a single neuron for 12K input samples taken from the test set of PTB when performing CLLM.

Significance: In this work, we presented a stochastic computing method that enables us to perform all the recurrent multiplications using XNOR operations. We believe that the proposed technique can be introduced to NeurIPS audiences with a successful application to quantization of LSTMs which is of a paramount importance when designing dedicated hardware. We also agree with the reviewer's comment that the proposed stochastic method is a general approach and can be used in other applications, making it even more interesting to NeurIPS audiences. Moreover, we believe that this work will have a huge impact on the SC community as this is **the first successful application of SC** where using SC preserves the latency intact as apposed to the standard SC that incurs a long latency when comparing with the non-stochastic implementations.

(a) Non-stochastic Gate Computations

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51

52

53 54

55

56

57

59

60

(b) Non-stochastic State Computations (c) Our Stochastic Gate Computations

(d) Our Stochastic State Computations