A Closed Rectangular Container With A Square Base Is To Have A Volume Of 2000 Cm3. It Costs Twice As

A Closed Rectangular Container With A Square Base Is To Have A Volume Of 2000 Cm3. It Costs Twice As much to manufacture compared to other container designs, making it essential to optimize its dimensions for cost-efficiency without compromising volume. This scenario is common in industrial applications, storage solutions, and packaging industries where maximizing capacity while minimizing costs is crucial. In this comprehensive guide, we will explore the geometric principles behind designing such a container, how to determine its optimal dimensions, and the factors influencing its manufacturing cost. Whether you're an engineer, a student, or a manufacturing professional, understanding these concepts will help you create cost-effective and efficient containers for various applications.

Understanding the Basic Geometry of the Container

Shape and Dimensions

The container in question is a closed rectangular box with a square base. Its key features include:
- A square base with side length x cm
- Height h cm
- Total volume V = 2000 cm^3

Because the base is square, the area of the base is:
$$ \text{Area of base} = x^2 $$

The volume of the container is given by:
$$ V = x^2 \times h $$
Substituting the known volume:
$$ x^2 \times h = 2000 $$
which allows us to express h in terms of x:
$$ h = \frac{2000}{x^2} $$

Surface Area and Cost Implications

The surface area influences manufacturing costs, especially when the cost per unit area differs for the base, sides, and top. For a closed container with a square base:

- Area of the base: x^2
- Area of the four sides: $4 \times x \times h$
- Area of the top (if applicable): x^2

If the container is fully enclosed (top and bottom), the total surface area A is:
$$A = x^2 + x^2 + 4xh = 2x^2 + 4xh$$

Using the earlier expression for h:
$$A = 2x^2 + 4x \times \frac{2000}{x^2} = 2x^2 + \frac{8000}{x}$$

This formula is crucial for cost analysis, as the total manufacturing cost depends on the surface area and the cost per unit area.

Optimizing Dimensions for Cost-Effective Manufacturing

Cost Factors and Material Costs

Manufacturing costs typically depend on:
- Material costs for different parts (base, sides, top)
- Manufacturing complexity
- Surface area: larger areas require more material and labor

In many cases, the cost per unit area varies; for example:
- The base might be made of a thicker, more expensive material
- The sides might use lighter or cheaper materials
- The top may be optional or have different costs

Assuming the cost per unit area for:
- Base: C_b
- Sides: C_s
- Top: C_t

and considering the container is fully enclosed, the total cost C_{total} is:
$$C_{total} = C_b \times x^2 + C_t \times x^2 + C_s \times 4xh$$

If the costs are uniform, i.e., $C_b = C_s = C_t$, then:
$$C_{total} = C \times (2x^2 + 4xh)$$
which simplifies to:
$$C_{total} = C \times A$$
where A is the total surface area.

Finding the Optimal Dimensions

To minimize costs, the key is to minimize surface area A for a fixed volume:

$$ A = 2x^2 + \frac{8000}{x} $$

Differentiate A with respect to x to find its minimum:

$$ \frac{dA}{dx} = 4x - \frac{8000}{x^2} $$

Set the derivative to zero:

$$ 4x - \frac{8000}{x^2} = 0 $$
$$ 4x = \frac{8000}{x^2} $$
$$ 4x^3 = 8000 $$
$$ x^3 = 2000 $$
$$ x = \sqrt[3]{2000} $$

Calculate:

$$ x \approx \sqrt[3]{2000} \approx 12.6\, \text{cm} $$

Now, find h:

$$ h = \frac{2000}{x^2} $$
$$ h = \frac{2000}{(12.6)^2} $$
$$ h \approx \frac{2000}{158.76} \approx 12.6\, \text{cm} $$

Thus, the optimal dimensions are approximately:
- Base side length $x \approx 12.6\, \text{cm}$
- Height $h \approx 12.6\, \text{cm}$

This results in a cube-like shape, which often minimizes surface area for a given volume, hence reducing manufacturing costs.

Design Considerations and Practical Applications

Material Selection and Cost Optimization

Choosing the right materials significantly affects the overall cost:
- Use durable but lightweight materials for sides to reduce material costs.
- Consider thicker materials for the base if it bears more weight.
- Use cost-effective materials for the top if it’s not exposed to wear.

Manufacturing Constraints and Real-World Factors

- Manufacturing Tolerances: Slight deviations in dimensions can affect volume and cost.
- Material Availability: Certain sizes and shapes may be easier or cheaper to produce.
- Structural Integrity: Ensure that the optimal dimensions also meet strength requirements.

Additional Design Features

- Incorporate handles or reinforcement ribs if necessary.
- Design for ease of assembly and disassembly.
- Consider stacking features for storage efficiency.

Conclusion: Achieving Cost Efficiency in Container Design

Designing a closed rectangular container with a square base to hold a volume of 2000 cm^3 involves balancing geometric principles and cost factors. By applying calculus, specifically optimization of surface area, the optimal dimensions emerge as approximately 12.6 cm for both the base side and height, resulting in a cube-like shape that minimizes material use and reduces manufacturing costs. Understanding the interplay between volume, surface area, and material costs enables engineers and designers to create cost-effective containers suited for various industrial and commercial applications.

In summary:
- Key points to remember:
1. The volume constraint defines the relationship between dimensions.
2. Minimizing surface area reduces manufacturing costs.
3. Optimal dimensions are found via calculus, specifically setting the derivative of surface area to zero.
4. Practical considerations include material properties, manufacturing tolerances, and structural requirements.

By leveraging these principles, manufacturers can produce efficient, cost-effective containers that meet volume specifications while minimizing material and production costs. Whether for packaging, storage, or industrial use, applying geometric optimization ensures smarter design choices and better resource management.

Keywords for SEO optimization:

- Rectangular container design
- Square base container
- Container volume optimization
- Manufacturing cost reduction
- Geometric optimization in engineering
- Cost-effective container dimensions
- Surface area minimization
- Industrial container design
- Material cost efficiency
- Engineering calculations for containers

Frequently Asked Questions

What are the optimal dimensions for a closed rectangular container with a square base to hold 2000 cm^3 volume at minimum cost?

The optimal dimensions are when the height equals twice the side length of the square base, which can be derived using calculus to minimize the surface area for the given volume.

How does the cost of constructing a closed rectangular container with a square base relate to its surface area?

The cost is directly proportional to the surface area, so minimizing the surface area for a fixed volume reduces the overall cost.

If the cost of material for the sides is half the cost of the base, how does this affect the optimal dimensions of the container?

This cost difference influences the optimal dimensions by weighting the surface area contributions, leading to a different optimal height and base size compared to uniform costs.

What mathematical approach is used to determine the minimum cost dimensions of the container?

Calculus optimization, specifically setting up the surface area function with volume constraints and finding its minimum using derivatives.

Why is the container's volume fixed at 2000 cm^3 when determining the optimal design?

The volume constraint ensures the container meets specific capacity requirements, guiding the optimization of its dimensions for cost efficiency.

Additional Resources

A Closed Rectangular Container With A Square Base Is To Have A Volume Of 2000 Cm^3. It Costs Twice As

---

Introduction

In the realm of industrial design and manufacturing, optimizing the use of materials while maintaining structural integrity and functionality is a perennial challenge. Whether in packaging, storage, or transportation, containers are fundamental components that demand both efficiency and cost-effectiveness. One intriguing problem that often arises is designing a closed rectangular container with a square base to hold a specified volume, while minimizing material costs. Conversely, understanding how costs change relative to design constraints provides critical insights for engineers and economists alike.

This article delves into the mathematical and practical aspects of constructing such a container with a volume of 2000 cm^3, examining the factors influencing cost, and exploring the implications of the statement: "It costs twice as..."—a phrase that hints at comparisons between different design options or material choices. Through rigorous analysis, we aim to uncover the optimal dimensions, cost considerations, and real-world applications relevant to this classic problem.

The Mathematical Framework

Defining the Variables

Let’s establish the parameters of our problem:

- x: Length of each side of the square base (cm).
- h: Height of the container (cm).

Since the container has a square base and is closed, its volume and surface area are key to determining both capacity and cost.

Volume Constraint

Given the volume $V = 2000 \text{ cm}^3$:

$$
V = x^2 h = 2000
$$

which allows us to express the height in terms of the base side:

$$
h = \frac{2000}{x^2}
$$

Cost Analysis

Material Costs and Surface Area

Suppose the cost per unit area of the material is uniform. The total surface area A comprises:

- Base area: x^2
- Four side walls: $4xh$

Total surface area:

$$
A = x^2 + 4xh
$$

Substituting h:

$$
A = x^2 + 4x \left(\frac{2000}{x^2} \right) = x^2 + \frac{8000}{x}
$$

The total cost C is proportional to A:

$$
C = k \times A
$$

where k is the cost per unit area. For simplicity, we consider $k=1$ unit cost per cm^2, focusing on relative costs.

Minimizing Material Cost

The primary goal is to determine the design dimensions that minimize the material cost for the given volume:

$$
C(x) = x^2 + \frac{8000}{x}
$$

To find the minimum, differentiate $C(x)$ with respect to x:

$$
C'(x) = 2x - \frac{8000}{x^2}
$$

Set $C'(x) = 0$ for critical points:

$$
2x = \frac{8000}{x^2}
$$
$$
2x^3 = 8000
$$
$$
x^3 = 4000
$$
$$
x = \sqrt[3]{4000}
$$

Calculating:

$$
x \approx \sqrt[3]{4000} \approx 15.87 \text{ cm}
$$

Corresponding height:

$$
h = \frac{2000}{(15.87)^2} \approx \frac{2000}{252} \approx 7.94 \text{ cm}
$$

This critical point suggests the dimensions that minimize material costs for the given volume.

Exploring the Cost Relationship: "It Costs Twice As..."

Interpreting the Phrase

The phrase "It costs twice as" suggests a comparative analysis. There are two plausible interpretations:

1. Cost comparison between two different designs — perhaps between the optimal (minimum) cost design and another configuration.

2. Cost comparison between different materials — such as a cheaper material versus a more expensive one, with the cost of the latter being twice as high for the same surface area.

For the purposes of this analysis, we explore the first interpretation: comparing the minimal cost design with a less efficient, alternative design that costs twice as much.

Case Study: Cost Comparison Between Optimal and Non-Optimal Designs

The Optimal Design

From the previous calculations, the optimal dimensions are:

- Base side $x \approx 15.87$ cm
- Height $h \approx 7.94$ cm

The corresponding surface area:

$$
A_{optimal} = x^2 + \frac{8000}{x} \approx 15.87^2 + \frac{8000}{15.87} \approx 252 + 503.76 \approx 755.76 \text{ cm}^2
$$

Total cost (assuming unit cost):

$$
C_{optimal} \approx 755.76
$$

The Non-Optimal Design

Suppose we consider a more "rectangular" design, for example, a taller, narrower container with the same volume but increased surface area, leading to higher material costs.

Let’s choose a height $h' = 2h \approx 15.88$ cm, and find the corresponding base side:

$$
x' = \sqrt{\frac{2000}{h'}} = \sqrt{\frac{2000}{15.88}} \approx \sqrt{125.78} \approx 11.21 \text{ cm}
$$

Surface area:

$$
A' = (x')^2 + 4 x' h' = 125.78 + 4 \times 11.21 \times 15.88 \approx 125.78 + 711.21 \approx 836.99 \text{ cm}^2

$$
C' \approx 836.99
$$

Compare with the optimal:

$$
\frac{C'}{C_{optimal}} \approx \frac{836.99}{755.76} \approx 1.11
$$

This shows that increasing the height reduces the base size but increases the overall surface area, raising costs by approximately 11%. To double the cost, the design would need an even larger surface area, perhaps by choosing a flatter, wider container or a very tall, narrow one with more surface area.

Practical Implications

Cost Efficiency in Manufacturing

The analysis reveals that the minimal surface area configuration provides the most cost-effective design for a given volume. Deviations from this optimal point lead to increased material costs, with the inefficiency becoming more pronounced as the design diverges further from the optimal dimensions.

In real-world manufacturing, factors such as material strength, stacking requirements, and aesthetic considerations often influence the final design. However, the underlying principle remains: minimizing surface area for a given volume minimizes material costs.

Material Choice and Cost Multipliers

If the material used in a less optimal design is twice as expensive per unit area, the total cost could double compared to the optimal design, even if the surface area is similar. Conversely, choosing cheaper materials or optimizing design parameters can significantly reduce costs.

Conclusion

Designing a closed rectangular container with a square base to hold exactly 2000 cm^3 involves a careful balance between dimensions and costs. The mathematical analysis shows that the minimal material cost is achieved when the base side length is approximately 15.87 cm, with a height of about 7.94 cm. Deviations from this optimal point tend to increase material usage and cost.

The phrase "It costs twice as" underscores the importance of optimization—whether through design or material selection—in controlling costs. In practical scenarios, understanding these relationships enables engineers and manufacturers to make informed decisions, balancing cost efficiency against other constraints such as structural stability, aesthetics, and manufacturing limitations.

In essence, the interplay between geometry and economics exemplifies the importance of mathematical reasoning in real-world engineering problems. By analyzing the cost implications of different design choices, industries can achieve significant savings and improve overall efficiency—a testament to the power of optimization principles in everyday applications.

References

- Anton, H., Rorres, C. (2002). Elementary Linear Algebra. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hill, R., and Holbery, J. (2010). Materials for Engineering. CRC Press.
- Stewart, J. (2015). Calculus: Early Transcendentals. Cengage Learning.
- Smith, J. (2018). Design Optimization in Manufacturing. Journal of Industrial Engineering.

A Closed Rectangular Container With A Square Base Is To Have A Volume Of 2000 Cm3 It Costs Twice As

A Closed Rectangular Container With A Square Base Is To Have A Volume Of 2000 Cm3 It Costs Twice As

Related Articles

- A Projectile Is Shot Straight Up From The Earth's Surface At A Speed Of 1.30104 Km/hr. How High Does
- A Key Principle Learned In The Little Albert Experiment Was That Group Of Answer Choices Fear Can Be
- What Are The Major Differences Between Federal Law Enforcement And Local And State Police Agencies?

Back to Home