Enough. I’ve had enough of this hair-dryer blast of a heatwave which makes life outside the world of air-con an ordeal. I’ve had enough of trying not to sweat on my fellow commuters in packed Thameslink trains. And I’ve had enough barbecues for two summers, let alone one.

Admittedly, this is monstrous ingratitude for the best summer I can remember. But when the mercury tops 35C, we all can get a bit cranky. Our political class has gone doo-lally for starters.
To put this week's thermometer-busting temperatures in context, the average sweet spot for economic productivity is barely a third of the current level: 13°C. A trio of experts, Marshall Burke, Sol Hsiang and Ted Miguel, studied the impact of temperatures in 2015 for Nature magazine, looking at data from 166 countries over a 50-year period. They found that an average annual temperature of 13°C was the optimum; funnily enough the world's three biggest economies in the US, China and Japan are closest to that level, with the UK and Germany just behind.

Once countries pass the lucky 13°C mark, they found an increasingly strong correlation between its flagging economic performance and its temperature. The hotter a country is to begin with, the more economic damage an extra one degree of warming does.

That raises a broader point about global warming; if temperatures rise as forecast towards the end of this century, lost productivity could knock nearly a quarter off global incomes. But that rising mercury also brings more inequality as cooler, richer countries get closer to the mark and hotter tropical countries struggle to make economic headway.
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In London itself the cost of a heatwave can have a major financial impact (apart from the inevitable irritability, loss of concentration and tube perspiration).

Our capital is a concrete and asphalt metropolis which radiates warmth thanks to the so-called “heat island” effect, which makes urban areas hotter than their rural surrounds. The London School of Economics’ climate change researchers attempted to compare the impact of a heatwave on three European cities to work out the impact two years ago. They found the cost to London’s economy in warm years could be anything between €1.9 billion and €2.3 billion — or 0.4% of the city’s output expressed in 2005 terms.

Relatively speaking though, London had smaller losses than the other two cities in the study, Antwerp and Bilbao, due to the greater share of financial services produced here and the relative lack of exposure of that sector to heat stress.

London — in fact the UK — isn't built for extremes, either of hot or cold. But as things warm up that might need to change? The boldest call from the LSE researchers was for a London “siesta”, potentially saving the city around €700 million in regained productivity by the end of the century.

In weeks like this a long break in the middle of the day certainly has a superficial appeal. It would give a breather to the capital’s army of construction workers and it might also be better for the environment.
But can we really imagine a city on London’s scale taking a three-hour nap every day? And for the sake of the rest of the country, we can’t really afford to.

The Office for National Statistics’ latest figures put the capital’s productivity some 33% above the UK average in 2016. The only other region with an above-average rating was the South-East.

So we Londoners have to soldier on stoically through the heat, carrying the economy on our sweat-soaked shoulders.