

A Global Survey of Satellite Impacts on Astrophotography: A Technical Report

Ruskin Hartley and Bettymaya Foott
December 9, 2025



1. Introduction

The proliferation of artificial low-Earth orbit satellites has prompted significant concern within the global dark sky community. As thousands of new objects are placed into orbit, their trails increasingly degrade images of the night sky, compromising scientific datasets, cultural heritage, and artistic expression. The 2025 Dark Sky global survey represents a key effort to quantify these impacts, specifically focusing on the experiences of amateur and professional astrophotographers who are often on the front lines of this emerging form of pollution.

This report presents a technical analysis of the survey results. Its objective is to provide a clear, data-driven overview of the challenges facing the astrophotography community. It covers the severity of satellite interference, the hidden costs associated with mitigation, the effectiveness of current software-based solutions, and the community's perspective on the future viability of their practice.

The following sections will detail the survey's methodology and respondent profile, establish the technical context for why satellites are so visible to cameras, analyze the core quantitative and qualitative findings, and conclude with a summary of the survey's key takeaways.

2. Survey methodology and respondent profile

Understanding the survey's methodology and the demographic profile of its respondents is crucial for interpreting the validity and scope of its findings. The data presented in this report were gathered from a diverse and highly experienced group of astrophotographers, lending significant weight to their collective assessment of the current state of satellite interference.

The survey, administered by DarkSky International, captured a global snapshot of the astrophotography community's experiences over a two-week period in the summer of 2025.

- **Survey Administrator:** DarkSky International
- **Survey Period:** July 31 to August 16, 2025
- **Total Respondents:** 203
- **Geographic Scope:** 31 countries

The respondent profile reveals a community of dedicated and seasoned practitioners. The data paints a clear picture of the typical respondent: a highly experienced amateur (63% have over 5 years of

experience); from an English-speaking country like the United States (70), Australia (21), Canada (19), or the United Kingdom (12); who possesses a long-term perspective on the escalating changes to the night sky. The community is predominantly composed of amateurs, with 65% identifying as 'Amateur/hobbyist' and 22% as 'Professional/semi-professional/commercial'.

The following section will examine the technical reasons why this community is particularly vulnerable to satellites that are often invisible to the naked eye.

3. The technical context: The visibility gap between human eyes and astrophotography equipment

To understand the scale of the satellite interference issue, it is essential first to understand the physics of light detection. The core problem lies in the profound difference in sensitivity between the human eye and modern camera sensors—a concept we are calling the "visibility gap." Even when satellites are dimmed below the threshold of human vision, they remain extraordinarily bright to the sensitive digital sensors used in astrophotography.

The astronomical magnitude scale quantifies this gap. Under ideal dark-sky conditions, the detection limits of different observers and equipment vary dramatically.

- **Dark-Adapted Human Eye:** Reaches an approximate magnitude 6-7, the traditional limit for naked-eye visibility.
- **Single Untracked Wide-Field Exposure (e.g., 24mm lens, 15 seconds):** Reaches approximate magnitude 8-9, detecting objects **6 to 16 times fainter** than the eye can see.
- **Tracked & Stacked Wide-Field Image (e.g., 50 minutes):** Reaches approximate magnitude 11-12, detecting objects approximately **100 times fainter** than the eye can see.
- **Deep-Sky Telescope Image (several hours):** Reaches approximate magnitude 18-20, detecting objects up to **100,000 times fainter** than the eye can see.

This visibility gap has critical implications for satellite mitigation efforts. Even if a satellite is successfully dimmed to magnitude 7, making it invisible to the naked eye, it will still appear as a bright streak in all forms of astrophotography.

- In a tracked wide-field image aiming to capture faint nebulae or star fields, a magnitude 7 satellite can be on the order of **100 times brighter** than the faintest details in the photograph.
- In a deep-sky telescopic image targeting distant objects, a magnitude 7 satellite can be over **100,000 times brighter** (12.5 magnitudes) than the faintest target galaxies.

This technical context explains why a solution designed for visual observers—dimming satellites to naked-eye invisibility—does not solve the problem for astrophotographers. The next section will detail the real-world impacts of this visibility gap as reported by the survey respondents.

4. Analysis of Survey Findings

This section forms the core of the report, presenting a quantitative analysis of the survey data.

4.1. Severity and trends of satellite interference

The survey reveals that satellite interference is not a minor nuisance but a pervasive and significant issue for the vast majority of practitioners. While 11% of respondents reported minimal impacts, a cumulative 87% experience interference that is moderate or worse.

- **Moderate Interference:** 47% of respondents
- **Significant Interference:** 37% of respondents
- **Severe Interference:** 3% of respondents (work is entirely inhibited)

Furthermore, the problem is perceived as rapidly worsening. When asked to compare the current situation to five years ago, there was an overwhelming consensus. The survey data show that 97.5% (198 of 203 respondents) find that the impacts from satellites are "More." Respondents who quantified this trend reported perceived increases typically ranging from 100% to 200%.

4.2. The hidden costs of mitigation

The burden of satellite trails extends beyond ephemeral frustration, imposing quantifiable 'hidden costs' on practitioners. The survey reveals these costs manifest primarily as a direct tax on two of the astrophotographer's most valuable resources: time spent in post-processing and irreplaceable data collected in the field.

- **Additional post-processing time:** On average, astrophotographers spend approximately 27 extra minutes of editing per image to remove or reduce the impact of satellite trails.
- **Lost data:** An average of approximately 16 frames are lost per imaging session due to satellite contamination, representing a direct loss of time and effort spent under the stars.

4.3. Effectiveness of current mitigation strategies

The astrophotography community employs a range of software and techniques to combat satellite trails, with varying levels of success. The most common software packages used include Photoshop, PixInsight, Sequator, Lightroom, and Siril. While stacking algorithms are highly effective, the overall sentiment suggests that mitigation tools are struggling to keep up with the scale of the problem.

Mitigation Technique	Reported Effectiveness & Adoption
----------------------	-----------------------------------

Stacking with Rejection	Rated as the most effective technique; 63% of users find it "Extremely effective."
Manual Clone/Heal	Widely used (63% of users), but considered only "Moderately effective" by the largest group of its users.
AI-based Removal Tools	Noted as promising and "Extremely effective" by 39% of its users, but adopted less frequently than other methods.

The perceived evolution of these tools presents a complex picture. While a combined 60% of respondents feel that mitigation software has gotten "Better" or "Much better" over the past five years, this improvement appears insufficient. A plurality of respondents (41%) believe that current techniques are **not** keeping pace with the increasing number of satellites, suggesting a growing gap between the problem and its solution.

4.4. Perceptions of future viability: the 'break point.'

A significant concern within the community is the concept of an irreparable "break point"—a threshold of satellite density beyond which astrophotography becomes impractical or impossible.

The survey found that 78% of respondents believe such a break point exists. When asked to estimate this threshold, the median figure provided was approximately 25,000 active satellites. A notable cluster of estimates fell between 25,000 and 40,000 satellites, indicating a shared sense of a looming ceiling for the viability of their practice.

5. Summary of key qualitative insights

Beyond the quantitative data, the survey's open-ended responses provide critical insight into the experiential and cultural toll of satellite proliferation. This feedback reveals a community grappling not only with technical hurdles but also with frustration and a sense of loss. Distilling the primary themes from these responses highlights the human dimension of the satellite issue.

- **Urgent need for AI and automation:** A strong and consistent theme was the desire for more intelligent, automated, and less time-consuming mitigation tools. Practitioners are seeking solutions that can handle the high volume of satellite trails without requiring hours of manual intervention for each image.
- **Frustration and diminished experience:** Beyond the technical workflow, respondents articulated a significant emotional and experiential toll. The constant need to contend with satellite trails

was reported to detract from the creative and contemplative aspects of astrophotography, transforming a passion into a chore defined by frustration and a sense of degradation of the experience.

- **Cultural and heritage concerns:** Perhaps the most profound theme was the deep concern over the loss of the natural night sky as a shared human heritage. Respondents view the increasing number of satellites not just as an obstacle to their hobby, but as a fundamental alteration and pollution of a natural resource essential to human connection with the cosmos.
- **Calls for regulation and international oversight:** A recurring theme was the recognition that technical solutions alone are insufficient. Respondents expressed a clear desire for policy interventions and stronger governance to manage the proliferation of satellites, viewing the current situation as largely unregulated.

These qualitative insights underscore that the impact of satellite constellations extends far beyond pixels and data, touching on the very experience and cultural value of the night sky.

6. Conclusion

The 2025 DarkSky global survey presents a clear and troubling picture of how satellite constellations are affecting astrophotography. The vast majority of practitioners report significant and rapidly worsening interference. This disruption carries real, measurable costs—both in additional hours of post-processing and in the permanent loss of irreplaceable imaging data. Although new mitigation tools are emerging, most respondents agree that these solutions are not keeping pace with the accelerating rise in satellite numbers. Many believe the field is approaching a potential “break point” in its long-term viability, with the median threshold estimated at around 25,000 satellites. The qualitative responses also highlight a deep sense of frustration and cultural loss, showing that the impact of satellite proliferation is not only technical and practical, but also profoundly emotional.

7. Acknowledgment

The author acknowledges the use of a large language model, Gemini (Google), for assistance with data analysis, drafting the initial Report, and clarity suggestions. The section on visibility analysis is based on material provided by Sarah Mathews. The human authors are fully responsible for the content, accuracy, and verification of all final material.