

important, but that the language of the Commission and the record as a whole indicated that too little importance was given to other evidence relevant to causation, i.e., immediate onset of pain and continued physical problems after the appellant's work-related fall. We believe the same error has been committed here.

[5] The testimony before the administrative law judge in the case at bar was that the appellant had never had problems with his back until the fall in April 1988; that he experienced severe pain immediately after the accident; that he continued to work, though with much difficulty which was noticeable to his co-employee; and that the pain and loss of control he was having progressed to a point where medical attention was necessary.

Based on these facts, we find that the opinion of the Commission fails to display a substantial basis for denial of relief. Therefore, we reverse the decision of the full Commission and remand to the Commission to award appropriate benefits.

Reversed and remanded.

DANIELSON and MAYFIELD, JJ., agree.

[Next printed page is 47.]